VOLUME VII NUMBER 3

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JULY 1933

EDITORIAL

AMONG THE SCHOLARS WHO HAVE DEVOTED THEMSELVES TO ANABAPTIST history, the name of Professor Dr. Johann Loserth of Graz, Austria, will always stand out as one of the greatest, not only in fruitful and authoritative research but in fair and sympathetic interpretation. His interest in Anabaptism has continued unabated, and the REVIEW considers itself fortunate in being able to present another valuable contribution from his pen, which is the result of the study of a recently discovered document. Dr. Loserth is already past eighty, but still active. His many friends, including the editors, tender him sincere greetings of affection and regard, and wish him continued health and happy days in the closing years of a career which has been so fruitful and filled with achievement. The article, "Anabaptists in Styria in 1528," is one more link in a growing chain of evidence that the Anabaptist movement was a powerful popular movement (*Volksbewegung*) which had the sympathy of many of the nobility and higher officials, and which might possibly have resulted in a real "reform" of the Christian Church had not bitter persecution cut short its career before its program was fully formulated and applied.

ANOTHER AND STILL STRONGER PROOF OF THE POWERFUL POPULAR CHARacter of the Anabaptist movement is found in John Horsch's careful and well-documented study of the struggle between Zwingli and the Swiss Brethren in Zurich, which the REVIEW presents in this issue as the third of the series on the history of the Swiss Brethren. Nowhere else in all the literature of the Swiss Reformation can be found such a clear demonstration of the fact that if let alone the Swiss Brethren movement could have become a powerful constructive force for the rebuilding of the Christian Church and the constructive reform of society. It had won the support or friendly tolerance of powerful figures in the public life of the Canton of Zurich in addition to a wide popular support. It was not viewed by the people as a movement dangerous to the state and the social order.

Horsch proves without the shadow of a doubt that the executions of the early Anabaptist leaders were not due to seditionary or revolutionary activities, but solely to their increasing influence as religious leaders and the threat they constituted to the Zwinglian movement. The City Council of Zurich persecuted the Anabaptists because Zwingli forced them to do so, and Zwingli wanted the persecution to save his own program.

For the first time also indisputable proof is here presented that the execution of Jacob Grebel was forced by Zwingli because of Grebel's protection of the rights of freedom of teaching and preaching by the Swiss Brethren. It now becomes clear that the execution of Zwingli was a hasty act of "terror," a judicial murder, intended to break down the resistance of the liberal-minded tolerant leaders of the minority in Zurich to Zwingli's program. This shocking act now stands out in clear relief, and none of the specious pleading by Zwingli in justification of his behavior (which, by the way, has been repeated without adequate examination by the modern defenders of Zwingli) can remove the stain of the deed from his record. As Horsch properly remarks, we see the logical consequences of the union of church and state in this affair, and Jacob Grebel becomes one of the earliest martyrs to the cause of freedom of conscience and religious toleration.

An exhaustive history of the Amish settlement in Union County, Pennsylvania, concludes the interesting and valuable study of this group which was begun in the last issue of the Review by John Umble, who is himself a descendant of one of the early families mentioned in the account. The history here presented is based upon a careful study of the available public documents in the Union county archives, together with reminiscences of a considerable number of the surviving members of the old community. In addition to the valuable material for local history which the article presents, the description of the participation of leaders of the community in the wider Amish church life of the period, as well as the account of the disintegration of the local church life, constitute valuable sources of information for the interpretation of Amish Mennonite history in America in recent times. Professor Umble will appreciate information from any source adding to or correcting the account which he presents in this issue.

As the final article in this issue Dr. Edward Yoder presents a study of some of the post-war literature dealing with the conscientious objector. Two of the books discussed deal with the C. O. in the World War, while the third treats of the same type in the Civil War. Dr. Yoder will continue to review the current literature dealing with the conscientious objector and the modern peace movement from the point of view of the Christian "pacifist" or non-resistant.

ANABAPTISTS IN STYRIA IN 1528*

JOHANN LOSERTH

Graz, Austria

The great German Reformation was accepted in the Hapsburg crown lands with extraordinary enthusiasm in Upper and Lower Austria. In Styria, Carinthia and Carniola the followers of Luther were enthusiastically received, while in the Outer Austrian (Vorderösterreich) territories the teachings of Zwingli were accepted, and the Anabaptists from Switzerland spread over the Tyrol and the eastern Austrian territories. In the lands along the Danube a movement developed much like that when a large ant hill is forcibly broken up. There was scarcely a single place where the old peace and quiet remained. Unfortunately this revolution has not yet found its historian to report its beginnings and its development.

When I undertook the writing of the history of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation in the Inner Austrian territory of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola some forty years ago, I learned to my regret that the sole important document which contained information about the beginnings of the Reformation in these countries was inaccessible to research. I was able to find only few details in the older writings which had used this important source, which could not give the full truth because of ecclesiastical bias. But now this important source is accessible to the historian. It bears the title, *Register der Visitation und Inquisition im Lande Steyer Gehalten in Jahre* 1528. A good copy is to be found in the Provincial Archive of Styria in Graz as manuscript No. 1662.

The table of contents reads as follows:

FOLIO 1: *Announcement and Invitation.*
In the year 1528 the priests, beneficiates, etc., are required to appear before the examiners and inquisitors at the places hereinafter described.

FOLIO 2-74:
The content of the examinations of the clerical and lay population is listed.

FOLIO 75-172: *Examinations of the inhabitants of the following cities*s
Hartberg (fol. 75); Kreutz (75 b.); Leoben (82 b.); Rottenmann (85); Murau (88); Judinburg (93); Knittelfeld (93 b.); Voitsberg (94 b.); Windischgraz (95); Chilli (107); Marburg (109); Für-

* Translated from the German.

stenfeld (117); Graz (119). Scattered throughout are found recantations, letters of indulgence, as well as reports from Friedberg and Oberwölz among the rural parishes.

Folio 123-154: *A list of those subject to trial.*
Folio 55-165: *The monasteries.*
Folio 166-167 a.: *The final decision.*
Folio 167 b.: *Conclusion of the visitation and inquisition.*
Folio 168-172: *A list of the meeting places and parishes with rosters of communicants.*
Folio 172-173: *A list of those sentenced.*
Folio 173-174: *Enumeration of those subject to trial.*

According to the record the examinations were conducted at thirty fixed places. The clergy of each place, and the laymen appointed to assist, were to be on hand at the appointed days to give an account to the commissars according to the instructions received by the commissars, in regard to the ecclesiastical conditions in the place and its surrounding parishes. First the clergy and then the laity were examined, as to their attitude in matters of faith and ecclesiastical discipline, then as to conditions in regard to the worship of the saints, the teaching and the observance of the sacraments, the celebration of the mass, and the observance of the feast and fast days. Then audience was given to complaints which the clergy might have against the laity, and vice versa, whether the services were held regularly and whether the various endowments at the various places were managed according to their stipulations. The attitudes of both parties were then subjected to exhaustive scrutiny and those deserving punishment were either required to recant (when matters of faith were involved) or were punished with the rest (when matters of ecclesiastical discipline were involved).

In this fashion we receive an exact picture of the ecclesiastical situation in all thirty places, that is, in the entire province. It is impossible for me to report in detail on the examinations in the brief limits of this paper for that would amount to printing the whole document. I will confine myself to reporting a few details from several of the places and will attempt to discover the strength of the Reformation movement in general. When about three generations later during the time of the Counter-Reformation the forcible conversion of the native Protestants, or their expulsion from the country in case they did not accept Catholicism, took place, Protestantism had the majority of the population with 60 per cent. over against 40 per cent. for the Catholics. This is certainly a high proportion. However, we are able to see from the entries in the visitation records that as early as the first decade after Luther's

appearance the Reformation movement in Styria was very strong and had reached all classes of the population.

The visitation and examination began in May, 1528. In the first ten places confessions of adherence to the new faith, either to Luther's teaching or to Anabaptism (which already occasionally appears) are seldom found. Conditions change in this respect the nearer one comes to Graz, for this capital city, the seat of the provincial government, is the criterion for the attitude of the officials. For instance, we learn already in the tenth place (Rottenmann) that the people had left the church service when the royal decrees against the Reformation were read. We learn also that books and writings had come hither not only from Wittenberg, but also from Switzerland, and that among the latter were Anabaptist books from St. Gaul and St. Lorenz, as we discover from a statement made at Stanz. First it is said that certain scissors-grinders from Switzerland had brought Lutheran books and sermons. Second, it is said that Stephen Steinacker had been summoned to Rottenmann to give an account in regard to his sister, a nun, also on account of an Anabaptist whom he had captured and whom he was to send to the provincial chief magistrate (Landeshauptmann). In the third place, Paul, the son of a merchant lady in St. Lorenz, held Anabaptism rather highly and spoke much about it and treasured the little booklets of the Anabaptists. However, we must first deal with the Reformation in general, since thereby we will be able to observe not only its extent but also its depth. We will then speak about the Anabaptist movement at the conclusion.

In Rottenmann the provost reports such childish things that one must laugh. Zwingli and Luther are more loved by the people than is the Pope. Also, much is said about the Anabaptists. In Murau the "heavenly letter of indulgence" (apparently a parody of Tetzel) is attributed to the landowner Von Liechtenstein and the city magistrate. In this letter we read that "our true bishop and only high priest Jesus (Heb. 4:5) gives to each and every believer to-day and for all times a remission of all sins if they believe that he has died for them on the cross . . . . Whoever believes on his words will live as he believes." In Voitsberg the pastor submits several Lutheran booklets to the commissars. The wicked parts have already been cut out and burned in the stove in the inn. In Windischgraz the commissars have much to do. Here the preacher Haas, so says the parish priest, has created great confusion. It is the same Haas who soon lost his life on the gallows in Graz. Concerning him Vitus Göschl says that Haas had put three

tables together on Easter Day, the 12th of April, and celebrated the Lord's Supper with a large number of men and women together. As he was distributing the bread he spoke these words: "May the faith which you have in the death of Jesus Christ lead you into eternal life." He had several plates of consecrated wafers, a cup and a paten (sacramental dish); he broke the wafers into pieces, laid them on the paten and spoke the above words. Thereupon each one took a wafer out of his hand and ate it. Further, it is reported that there are still two unbaptized children here, one in a certain family named Schlesinger, and the other with a family named Huter.

On the 18th of July, 1528 the commissars reached the last place at Graz. Here there were very extensive examinations, of which I wish to report only the items which indicate the attitude of the burgomaster and the members of the house of Dietrichstein, the chief magistrate of the province. The burgomaster of Graz was Simon Arbeiter. As burgomaster he was also head of the church. The accusations which the priest, Dr. Philip Preiner, the assistant priest, Peter Gruber, and others, bring against him are very extensive. Frequently it is stated that he is altogether "poisoned" by Lutheranism. It is said that he shows no respect for the sacrament and that he is the reason why the mass and the ceremonies are little observed. The ex-burgomaster, Walter Harrer, comes out still more sharply against the old church. He has a booklet in his hands, shows it to Dr. Tettenheimer and cries out, "Look you priests, you have deceived us and you see that the sacrament is nothing." Next the examination of the chief magistrate of the province is reported, Sigmund von Dietrichstein, to whose family, as is well known, the later Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein belonged, who played a leading part in the counter-reformation in Austria and drove the Moravian Anabaptists from their cherished Moravian abodes. Jesuit sources consider Sigmund von Dietrichstein as the true dragonkiller of heresy. In reality not only he himself, but also his wife, was a friend and protector of the Anabaptists, and so in the examination charges are made against him. Dr. Hans Tettenheimer says that the chief magistrate permitted the Lutheran priests to stop frequently and preach. Another witness says the same, while a third reports that the chief magistrate did not hold the sacrament in honor, that he admonished him and his family to be evangelical, and that meat was eaten in the chief magistrate's home during the time of Lent. Two officials who were discharged because of their evangelical preach-

ing he retained. One witness states that the chief magistrate said that Peter was never in Rome.

The same state of affairs was reported concerning the provincial regent Adam von Hollenegg, who was charged with having become completely Lutheran. These upper places in the provincial and city administrations were from henceforth for the most part occupied by adherents of the Augsburg Confession.

The story up to this point reveals that in addition to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, adherents of Anabaptism were also present in the land, as earlier histories written by Mennonites* themselves had repeatedly stated, making reference to their brethren in the faith who suffered the martyr's death, such as the martyrs of Bruck an der Mur in the very year in which this visitation and examination was held.[1] The martyrs of Bruck were not the only ones who fought for their faith and fell in the conflict. The list of martyrs of the Mennonites tells of martyrs in Graz, Bruck an der Mur, Hundsmarkt, and Griesbach,—altogether twenty-five martyrs. We know their number only, not their names, except one Daniel Kropf who was active in Graz in teaching his faith, and is known as a hymn-writer as well. The visitation record mentions at several different places two Anabaptists who were very active in promoting their faith. They were the painters Kilian and Kaspar in Graz. Concerning Kilian it is said that he did not respect baptism and that he advocated many items of church reform in Bruck. It is said that he claimed "that the priests sold the sacrament." The location of Kaspar's house is indicated in a general way only. He did not want to have one of his children baptized and said that no man had a free will and that God let himself be baked in an oven. We become acquainted with the painter Kaspar from the contemporary records. In the year 1529 Michael Meizner, vice-gerent in Styria, presented King Ferdinand a petition from Franz and Caecilia, children of the painter Kaspar in Graz, stating that he had taken up Anabaptism, had instructed other persons therein, and had baptized. Although he had been imprisoned and instructed, he had not been ready for a long time to give up his error, but finally he had professed to have done so, for he recanted and left the place. Where he had been

---

* For want of a better term, the word "Taufgesinnten" used by the author is translated by "Mennonites."—Ed.

1 Cf. *Lieder der Hutterischen Brueder,* page 25; in regard to Daniel Kropf, see page 59 of the same book. About the Anabaptists in Styria see J. Loserth in *Mitteilungen des Hist. Vereins in Steiermark,* Vols. 42 and 50, and *Zeitschrift des Hist. Vereins,* Vol. 10.

living since then no one knows. His house was torn down by royal decree and the land was sold to other citizens.

More important than this case was the case of Kaspar von Steyer. Since he and the teachers of Anabaptism traveled on their journeys through the whole of Austria, he appeared before the commissars in the command of the provincial chief magistrate, on Thursday, the 23rd of July, 1528 and was extensively examined in the presence of the provincial regent, Adam von Hollenegg. He was asked whether he had baptized anyone. His reply was that he had baptized no one but was baptized himself in the city of Steyer on St. Veits day (June 15) by Hans Hut, the well-known leader of the Anabaptists and opponent of Hubmaier. Hans Hut marked the sign of the cross on his forehead, had the water ready in a vessel, and then baptized him and many others, and said, "I baptize you in the name of God the Father . . ." There were three priests and two councillors present who were also baptized. The room was full of people at the time. He was asked where he wanted to go. The pastor of the place spoke to him, "Oh, new Christian, you are come hither again." Hut said, "Christ said go into all the world . . ." He heard two sermons preached by Hut about the sacrament, which did not please him and he did not attend his preaching any further. However, he attended the Lord's Supper once. He said that he knew that the King had granted mercy to many. When asked to show why he had not also received mercy he answered that he did not understand it. Further he said Veit Schäffer, Fritz Peck, Hans Zeller, and three councillors had been pardoned. "Peutler" (very likely one who makes leather purses) had escaped but was later executed at Peffen. He had also been a resident of Steyer. Further he said that Paul Schmidt, Heinrich Pader, and Lukas Schlosser gave the King 25 gulden for a pardon. Schlosser told him himself that Herr Jakob, the son of Grüntaler at Steyer, and Herr Jeronymus, the three priests, were present at the time, and that Jeronymus was executed at Salzburg.

That Anabaptism was able to gain entrance into the upper circles of the population is evidenced by the case of the wife of a certain Katzianer. Hans Katzianer was chief field captain from May 1530 to 1531 for the provinces of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, which were the provinces most threatened by the Turks. He later became well-known through his tragic fate when he fell by the hand of Zriny, the well-known defender of the fortress of Güns in Hungary. His wife appears several times in the records of the visitation where she appears as a zealous opponent of the clergy.

The minutes state the following in reference to her: "Victor Lampasch and Chaplain Michael Reiff said that the wife of Katzianer, when the royal mandates against the church reformation were read, called together her subjects and instructed them through her servants to disregard the royal commands and to render no service to the church and the priests. In case they should nevertheless do this they would have to give her three times as much. She had also disposed of the religious utensils which had been given in memory of her dead husband. She also had publicly announced that her subjects should not have any masses said for their dead or she would punish them for it. In other words she forbade anything whatsoever to be given to the priests.

It is not evident from these statements to which faith she belonged, but from a recent monograph, which appeared several months ago, it is clear that she belonged to the Anabaptists. The monograph was published by Johann Zeno (Count) Goess from the archives of his family under the title of "Eleven Letters of King Ferdinand I to his field captain, Hans Katzianer." In these letters King Ferdinand comforts his captain who had reported his sorrow and misfortune that his wife had become an Anabaptist. The letter carrying this statement is dated May 17, 1530, at Innsbruck, and says: "Dear Faithful Friend: We have noticed with most gracious sympathy your sorrow and misfortune but have learned that you have undertaken a well-planned procedure; namely, that you have requested the honorable Christoph, regent at Seckau and Bishop of Laibach, to undertake this matter for you, and that several of the clergy have been appointed to turn away your wife from her error." From the further comment of the letter we learn that two lay priests were responsible for leading the woman to such "error and apostasy," and that Katzianer was willing to do all he could to overcome it. The King suggests to him that he should not undertake any action against the two since he himself had already ordered the prosecution against the two lay priests. This case of Anabaptism penetrating into the circles of the Alpine nobility in general is not the only one, as is well known. In Tyrol members of the houses of Freiburg and Molkenstein and in Moravia members of the house of Liechtenstein, are known to have become Anabaptists.

In Styria the Anabaptists were able to secure no more followers after the Reichstag of 1530. Since the opinion was held that because of the Augsburg Confession the Styrian Protestants were assured of toleration, the other reform movements in the land were

not tolerated, and even the Augsburg Confession and its followers attacked in a similar manner Calvinists, Anabaptists, and the Flaccians. To come back to the case of the wife of Katzianer, there is a question which of his two wives was the Anabaptist, since he was married twice, first to Sarah Strein and then to Elizabeth Stermoller. From the above mentioned letter nothing can be proved definitely but from the statements made before the commissars it is possible to come to the conclusion that whoever it was changed from the Lutheran to the Anabaptist faith. According to the letters reported by Goess, the one who baptized her was Master Jakob Schuster, who "had with him a wife in a black coat, that came from the region of Innsbruck." The King had already commissioned the Statthalter, Rudolph Graf von Sulz, to hunt the two and punish them. The punishment for Anabaptists who did not recant was in most cases death.

By no means all the cases of Anabaptists in Styria are exhausted with these instances. For instance, a report is given from Radkensburg on July 4 that the citizens have little respect for baptism. In many other places there were likely also followers of Anabaptism. We know of such who were to be found among the miners of the Oberland and who were apparently able to maintain themselves for many years longer. Preacher Haas no doubt had the greatest following in the year 1528. The citizens with their wives crowded his services to hear his preaching. It is certain that 70 persons took part in one of his services for the celebration of the Lord's Supper which he conducted according to the manner of the apostles. His influence may also be detected in the statements made in several cases of recantation. On the 26th of June, five persons are listed, each of whom made a recantation in which we read: "Dear Lords and Friends; I herewith publicly confess that against God and Christian order by means of the misleading, heretical preaching, teaching, and instruction of Hans Haas I have several times spoken in a Lutheran, despicable, heretical and miserable manner about the worthy sacrament as though it were simply bread and wine, when it truly is the body and blood of our Lord . . ." Large crowds gathered for the execution of Haas and took pieces of the gallows and whatever else they could get hold of. Even after his execution the people wanted to be baptized only according to his baptismal formula, and to partake of the Lord's Supper only according to his formula. People like the burgomaster said to the chaplain, "You are reading the Mass? Humph, that's all the same as if we should throw our money into a mud hole."

And that was not the worst. In a vessel containing holy water human offal was found. The person who brought it thither was known. Also, men and women often sing at the bath and in their houses, "Oh, you cursed priests." At the end of the account the number of those who are worthy of punishment are given. It amounts to one hundred names, quite a stately number. We know that about the year 1578 almost the entire nobility of the land was Protestant. This should not surprise anyone who has already found in this list of the condemned of the year 1528 so many names of nobility such as Bernhard von Teuffenbach, Maximilian von Steinweise, Friedrich Gleinzer, Christoph von Mindorf, Jürg von Herberstein, Hans von Eibiswald, Jörg von Truebenegg, Hans von Kleinach, Sigmund von Dietrichstein, and others.

At the end of the examinations there occurred an interesting incident. The minutes report about this as follows: When the commission had finished its work on the 23rd of July the provincial chief magistrate, Herr Sigmund von Dietrichstein, appeared and reported to the commission that the populace brought severe complaints that the commissars were acting contrary to the freedom of the land (*Freiheiten des Landes*). In reply the commissars excused themselves, saying that they had acted according to the powers granted to them by the King and the ecclesiastical authorities. The provincial chief magistrate indicated that the provincial regent and delegates had not expected such conduct and were ready to leave the land, so wildly aroused were the people about the procedure followed by the commissars. Thereupon the commissars read their powers before the chief magistrate, reading also a special order from the King in which he stated that the Emperor criticised their procedure as being too mild. The next day the chief magistrate declared that the attitude of the populace was still more severe for the whole procedure was contrary to their liberties. Eventually the chief magistrate brought the whole thing to a halt.

As we summarize the results of the visitation and examination we are compelled to say that already but a few years after Luther's appearance and still sooner after the appearance of the Swiss Anabaptists, Lutheranism and Anabaptism had won a large number of adherents in the land of Styria. The most remarkable thing in the testimony of Hans Von Steyer is perhaps the statement that it was possible to secure a release from punishment by the use of money.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN ZWINGLI AND THE SWISS BRETHREN IN ZURICH

John Horsch

Twenty-four persons who refused to accept the decision of the Council of Zurich in regard to the burning religious issues of the day were imprisoned in the Augustinian convent in Zurich early in February, 1525. They were given a hearing and were after a short time released under heavy bond. On March 16, of the same year, the Council published a mandate decreeing that all who would henceforth be baptized should be exiled. Many were again imprisoned, among them Grebel, Manz and Blaurock with whom Zwingli had a three days discussion March 20-22. They were given a hearing, being called one by one before Zwingli and his assistants.

Twenty-one persons—fourteen men and seven women—were at this time sentenced to imprisonment in the dungeon of the Witch Tower. A few of them had candles and materials for striking fire which enabled them to read the Scriptures in the dark dungeon. Grebel, Manz and Blaurock led them in their worship and admonished them to steadfastness. Blaurock, not being a native of Zurich, was soon after this imprisonment banished with the threat of severe punishment if he returned. After about two weeks the prisoners found it possible to escape, probably with the aid of friends and patrons among the Councillors. Some of those who had escaped from prison entertained the thought of going to "the red Jews across the sea," having reference to America and the Indians, in the expectation of finding a land of liberty.

Between the month of November, 1524, and June, 1525, Zwingli published three books against the Brethren, and early in November, 1525, another in which he defended the state church position and advanced various accusations against the Brethren which they felt to be slanders. One of these books, the *Book on Baptism,* was his outstanding defence of infant baptism. Ever since the public debate on infant baptism the appearance of this book had been eagerly awaited. As early as February 8, 1525, the Council of Zurich wrote to the authorities of Schaffhausen that "Zwingli will forthwith publish a book on infant baptism." The authorities of Schaffhausen planned at this time for a public debate on baptism, but the Council of Zurich, being evidently apprehensive of the result, asked them to postpone this debate till after they

had read Zwingli's forthcoming book. Many of Zwingli's friends looked to him anxiously for the publication of a statement of his reasons for infant baptism, and even the Brethren desired that he publish such a statement,[1] since he had boasted repeatedly that he had defeated them in the great public debate and on other occasions, and the Council had made the same assertion. But not before the end of May did this booklet of Zwingli appear.

The Brethren had no adequate means for publicly defending their position. True, there had been a public debate early in the year, after a number of private debates. The discussions which Zwingli had with them in March of the same year have been also generally considered debates, although on these occasions the leaders of the Brethren were merely brought before Zwingli and were permitted to answer such questions as he would ask them. He, however, failed to concede them the right or give them the opportunity to express themselves freely and fully. This obvious fact was admitted even by Bullinger. In passing, the question of the general treatment accorded to the Brethren by Zwingli, in the debates which he had with them, deserves consideration.

As early as December, 1524, in a "Protestation"[2] addressed to the Council, Grebel complained that Zwingli and his associates "will not let us speak when they perceive that something would be said to establish the truth (on the pending questions)." Grebel states in the same place repeatedly that in his discussions with Zwingli he was often interrupted and was not permitted to speak. According to Bullinger the Brethren asserted that, "although a debate was held with us, we have never had a real opportunity to defend our position, for Zwingli does not permit any one of his opponents to express himself freely,"[3] "he cuts them off short and sometimes does not let them say anything, and thus maintains his cause not by God's Word but by his multitude of loud words and by the power of the government."[4] Furthermore, Bullinger states in the same place that this was said not only by the Anabaptists themselves but also by their patrons in the city and country who were not sparing in their severe criticism of Zwingli on this account. Again, Bullinger states that the influential patrons of the Brethren made severe complaint that the Brethren were persecuted without being given so much as a hearing. Not only the Brethren but their

1 Egli, *Actensammlung,* p. 289.

2 Printed *Zwinglis Werke,* III, 368-372; Staub, *Beziehungen des Täufers Conrad Grebel zu seinem Schwager Vadian,* 71-76.

3 Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 295.

4 *Wideroufferen ursprung,* fol. 10a.

influential patrons (including some of the Councillors) demanded that Zwingli should meet them in a real debate. In another place Bullinger, speaking of the discussions in general, admits that the Brethren were sometimes interrupted and stopped, but naively enough gives this reason: "They would say only what they desired to say and not what they should say."[5]

Zwingli himself gives a description of a debate on infant baptism between himself and Balthasar Hubmaier which throws light on the way and manner in which he met the dissenters in debates. In a letter to Peter Gynoräus about this disputation Zwingli wrote:

> When I came to I Cor. 10:2, "All our fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (namely while passing through the Red Sea), and was coming to the point of compelling him to acknowledge that infants were included (and were thus baptized while passing through the sea), and when he was unwilling to say whether or not they were included, I went for the man with too great severity, I must confess."[6]

Hubmaier, in one of his books, remarked that by such argumentation the verse following the above cited passage (I Cor. 10:2) would teach that the infants of Israel during the wilderness journey lived on spiritual food and spiritual drink which would point to infant communion. It may be worth noting in this connection that the Abyssinian church practices infant communion. It is administered by intinction.

And not only did Zwingli insist that the Brethren in the debates must "say what they [in his opinion] should say," if they desired to speak at all, but he made a somewhat similar demand even as concerned their preaching. He complained that in their preaching on baptism the Anabaptists confined themselves to presenting their own view of baptism, and that they "failed to give the reasons for infant baptism which were laid before them in Zurich," by Zwingli.[7]

Conrad Grebel's ardent desire that he be given permission for a defense through the press was never granted.[8] The Brethren asked for a public disputation worthy of the name, that is to say a debate in which they would be permitted to present and defend their doctrines freely, and to speak without being unduly interrupted and stopped by their opponents.

---

[5] *Von dem unverschampten fräfel,* fol. 117b.

[6] *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, p. 702.

[7] *Ibid.,* IV, p. 385, also p. 387.

[8] Egli, *Actensammlung,* p. 379.

Two written petitions of the Brethren to the Council are kept in the archives of Zurich, both of them touching appeals to arrange for such a debate. The Brethren wrote:

> Gracious, well-affected lords, we beg your wisdom to permit and arrange for a public discussion to which any one desiring to do so may come to be instructed from divine Scripture. If it is found from the divine Scriptures that we have erred, we shall gladly accept correction, be it in regard to baptism or other points.[9]
>
> For all things that are grounded in the Word of God we will stake and pledge our lives, honor and possessions. We beg you, gracious lords, to permit a debate, granting safe conduct to one or two of our men who, as our representatives, shall set forth all the pertinent scriptures, that every one may be able to decide whether our position is right or wrong. We desire nothing upon earth but to have these things decided according to the Word of God. We hope and believe that through the Word of God the truth can be clearly and plainly set forth and that your honors shall be able to appreciate our position.[10]

Zwingli and his assistants held, as stated previously, that it was "dangerous" to have public discussions with them. However, the Swiss Brethren movement continued to spread despite the persecution. The prospect for the success of the program adopted by Zwingli and his friends became more and more discouraging.

An indication of the immediate outlook for overcoming the dissenting movement is afforded by a letter of Leo Judae, the principal assistant of Zwingli in Zurich. This letter at the same time shows the spirit in which the Brethren were met and opposed by the state church party. Judae wrote in August 1525 to Vadian: "Either through our own fault or because of the vacillation, not to say negligence, of our magistrates, we are waging daily war with these most monstrous monsters, nor as yet do I believe that the struggle is ever going to be finished."[11] However, at a later time, after Zwingli's and the Council's methods used in combatting both Anabaptism and Romanism had failed, and disaster had overtaken the Zwinglian cause in the second war of Cappel in 1531, Judae changed his mind about the principal tenets of Anabaptism and concerning the propriety of calling upon the magistrates to suppress it. In this war of 1531, the military forces of Zurich were crushingly defeated, and Romanism was again established in certain districts in the same manner in which a few years earlier

9 *Ibid.*, p. 300; Füssli, *Beyträge*, I, p. 280.

10 Füssli, *Beyträge*, II, p. 358f.

11 *Vadianische Briefsammlung*, III, p. 118.

it had been abolished by the Council of Zurich. In consequence Judae was led definitely to see that those whom he in the above mentioned letter had so severely denounced, were scripturally orthodox in their opposition to infant baptism and state churchism and in their insistence on the need of church discipline.[12] He expressed himself clearly on these points.

As just stated, Zwingli did not desire another debate with the Brethren. However, in the autumn of 1525, the Council found itself in a situation which made imperative the granting of the petitions of the Brethren for a debate. In the principality of Grüningen, a part of the Canton Zurich, over one hundred Brethren were imprisoned. The magistrates of Grüningen were ordered by the Council of Zurich to send certain of these prisoners to Zurich to be tried and sentenced. This the magistrates refused to do, referring to an old prerogative by which they were authorized to exercise supreme jurisdiction over the citizens of this principality. The magistrates of Grüningen sympathized with the imprisoned Brethren who had the courage of their conviction and had never had the opportunity of defending or proving their faith publicly. Hence, instead of sending the prisoners to Zurich, they decided to send a deputation of four men with a missive to "our gracious lords" (the Council of Zurich) petitioning them earnestly and urgently for two favors: first to arrange for a public debate with the Anabaptists, and secondly to instruct Zwingli to "let the men of the opposing party have their say in the debate and not to interrupt and stop them, so that this question can finally be disposed of."[13]

Under these circumstances the Council could scarcely refuse the petition for a debate, but Zwingli was given the privilege of stating the topics to which the discussions must be limited. None of these topics calls for a discussion of the general Scriptural reasons for or against infant baptism. One of the topics contains the statement that those who allow themselves to be re-baptized crucify Christ afresh, and yet Zwingli had previously referred to baptism and other things in which the Brethren differed from him as unimportant outward things. Bullinger informs us that four men were appointed as judges to preside at the debate, in order that no one would be interrupted or "permitted to speak contrary to good

---

[12] Pestalozzi, *Leo Judae,* pp. 41-56; Schiess, *Briefwechsel der Brüder Blaurer,* I, p. 422f.

[13] Egli, *Actensammlung,* p. 398.

rules of order." The judges were leading representatives of Zwinglianism, among them Sebastian Hofmeister and Vadian.

The debate began on November 6 in the city hall but the hall proved too small for the throng of people attending. Hence the sessions were moved to the largest church of the city. Grebel, Manz and Blaurock defended their position against Zwingli and his assistants. At the close of the last session on November 8, the three leaders of the Brethren just named were again imprisoned in the Witch Tower. Martin Link and Michael Sattler were banished. After a short time the prisoners were released with the threat that "if they persisted in their dissent, the most severe punishment would be meted out to them."[14]

Immediately after the debate complaints were again heard that in the disputation the Brethren were not permitted to present their arguments and were scorned and ridiculed.[15] The Brethren felt that the discussions held did not deserve the name of debates. We have stated above that Zwingli, according to his own statement, admitted that he was unfair with Hubmaier in a debate with him. Hubmaier, in passing, finally fell upon a novel way of compelling Zwingli to meet him on equal terms: he published a booklet (at Nikolsburg in Moravia), quoting statements from Zwingli's *Book on Baptism* and meeting him point for point by his replies. This was indeed a fair way of meeting his opponent in a debate.

Early in March, 1526, Grebel, Manz and Blaurock and many other members of the Swiss Brethren Church, also Balthasar Hubmaier, found themselves again prisoners in Zurich. A terrible sentence was at this time pronounced over these men and fourteen other persons, among them the mother of Felix Manz and five other women who refused to recant. They were condemned to imprisonment for life in a dungeon on a diet of bread and water. The sentence which was pronounced over them demanded that "they shall remain in the dungeon to die and rot, and in case of sickness no one shall have authority to change their prison."[16] This inhuman sentence had the approval of the heads of the established church. Zwingli, in a letter, informed Vadian of these cruel measures "This day," he wrote, "the Council has decided that the Anabaptist leaders shall be cast into the Tower to remain there until they either give up the ghost or recant." He says further that the death sentence would be pronounced over those who further re-

---

14 Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 296.

15 *Ibid.,* p. 377.

16 *Ibid.,* p. 444.

baptized, and then adds: "Thus the long tried patience [of the Council] has come to an end." Balthasar Hubmaier who, as noted above, was one of the prisoners, complained in his reply to Zwingli's *Book on Baptism* of "the great severity and torment of this imprisonment."

On the same day when this sentence was pronounced, a mandate was published decreeing that any one who would henceforth re-baptize should be drowned without mercy—without trial or further hearing. The same punishment was to be executed on those who, having once recanted, were again found attending Anabaptist meetings or giving lodging or food to Anabaptists. "When all measures proved fruitless and the Anabaptists, contrary to divine and civil rights, continued to promote their sect," says Bullinger, "Anabaptism was forbidden on pain of death."[17]

Surprising and strange as it may seem, it is nevertheless a fact that the men and women who were condemned to the most cruel imprisonment for life, were within a few weeks released, as had also been the case on former occasions. One naturally asks, how is this extraordinary fact to be accounted for? A number of statements made by Zwingli in his letters to Vadian turn out to be the key to the solution of this question. Zwingli, referring to the trial of the imprisoned Brethren in which the above mentioned sentence was pronounced, wrote: "In vain did your father-in-law plead for mercy [for the Anabaptists who were to be sentenced]."[18] It may be recalled that Vadian's father-in-law was Jacob Grebel, Conrad's father, a nobleman and one of the most prominent and influential senators or councillors of Zurich. And Jacob Grebel did by no means stand alone in the Council of Zurich in favoring a policy of toleration toward the dissenters. A powerful minority in the Council took the same attitude toward the Brethren. This minority of councilmen, with the aid of the patrons of the Brethren outside the Senate, found it possible to prevent the carrying out of the severe mandates and sentences that were passed against them, and to bring about their release from imprisonment.

There is convincing evidence that previous to the death of Jacob Grebel, in October, 1526, the majority of the Council, which were decided on the persecution of the Brethren, saw their plans thwarted again and again by the advocates of a policy of leniency. Zwingli complained repeatedly of the machinations of Jacob Grebel and his "accomplices," and of the leniency of the authorities in

[17] *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 298.

[18] *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, p. 542.

these things, and Bullinger in his first book against the Brethren, made the statement that if it were not contrary to the orders of certain persons,[19] he would present damaging evidence against them. The "certain persons" whose desires Bullinger saw himself obliged to respect to such extent, were obviously of the upper classes. In all probability some of them were members of the Council. They objected to spreading the damaging reports about the Brethren which were founded on mere hearsay. No one could have prevented Bullinger from presenting actual evidence against them. He speaks of the Brethren as "an accursed sect."[20] Again he speaks repeatedly of the influential patrons and friends of the Brethren.[21] These patrons the Brethren had not only in Zurich but also in the principality of Grüningen.[22] Zwingli himself stated that "when the Council decreed that he should be drowned who re-baptized another," and when a large number of Anabaptists were sentenced to severe imprisonment "many of the brethren (his own followers) thought that what had been done to them was too monstrous."[23]

Conrad Grebel died within a few months after being released from the imprisonment referred to above. After his liberation he went to Maienfeld in the canton called Grisons, where his sister Barbara with her husband and family had her home. Here he was again thrown into prison where he died in July or August of 1526. While Conrad Grebel was not the founder of the Swiss Brethren Church in any such sense as Zwingli was the founder of the Reformed Church and Luther of the Lutheran Church, he was the most talented and prominent of the first leaders of the Brethren. As a talented young man of a prominent family he saw opportunities for a distinguished career if he would, like many others, quench his convictions and remain with the state church party which enjoyed the favor and protection of the civil authorities.

Conrad Grebel had ardently hoped that the leading reformers would, in agreement with their original programs, organize voluntary churches of the New Testament type, churches which consisted of believers walking in newness of life. He had hoped that, even if Protestant state churches were established, toleration would

---

19 *"Wenn es etwelcher personen halb fug hette."* Bullinger, *Von dem unverschampten fräfel,* fol. 19b.

20 *Ibid.,* fol. 143a.

21 *Widertoufferen ursprung,* fol. 9b, 10a, 213b.

22 Egli, *Zuricher Wiedertäufer,* p. 66.

23 Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 135f.

be granted the dissenters. But when these hopes proved disappointing he was ready to endure persecution for his scriptural convictions. For the sake of evangelical truth he became an outcast and virtually an outlaw, counting not his life dear unto himself. In consecration and "zeal for the Lord's house" he was clearly the equal of those who stood with him. Their ideal was the sincere acceptance and uncompromising carrying out of the whole of evangelical truth and its implications. Although Conrad Grebel's labors extended only over a period of less than three years, yet he accomplished much as a leader in one of the great movements in the history of the Christian church.

Despite the persecution, consisting of cruel imprisonment and the exacting of heavy fines, the Swiss Brethren movement spread, particularly in the principality of Grüningen in the canton of Zurich. The Council of Zurich sent a mandate to the authorities of Grüningen, decreeing that the death sentence must be pronounced and carried out not only over such prisoners as had been re-baptized but also over those who attended their meetings. This was indeed a strange demand in the face of the plain fact that even in Zurich the prisoners had heretofore always been finally released. There is clear evidence that the authorities of the principality of Grüningen had conscientious scruples against the execution of the Anabaptists. They persistently refused to stain their hands with the blood of the dissenters, as will be directly shown.

Zwingli and his immediate assistants in the work of the reformation of the church believed that the best interests of the church as well as of the state required the carrying out of their reform program, which included, as we have indicated, the establishment and maintainance of a state church comprising the whole population. This in turn necessitated the suppression of all dissent and in particular of the Swiss Brethren movement. However, as stated above, the Council of Zurich was not a unit in its attitude on this important question. As long as a strong minority of the Council, headed by Jacob Grebel, did all in their power to protect the dissenters in their loyalty to their convictions, it proved to be impossible to carry out the program of the State church party (which was headed by Zwingli). Besides, according to Zwingli's assertion, Jacob Grebel and others desired the toleration of Roman Catholics in Zurich and were of the opinion that one of the churches of the city should be restored to them. Zwingli was staunchly opposed to any such concession and yet he demand-

ed freedom for the preaching of the Gospel in Roman Catholic cantons.

Jacob Grebel favored a policy of toleration and liberty of conscience. The theory, by the way, that in those times there was no possibility of success for a state which adopted a policy of general religious toleration is erroneous. The danger of war between the Roman Catholic and Reformed cantons, would have been almost entirely eliminated if the government of Zurich had taken an attitude of toleration toward Romanism permitting Roman Catholic worship within its territory. And was not the existence of a number of congregations of the Bohemian Brethren in a Catholic country (Moravia) a proof that churches of varying creeds could exist side by side in the same country without disadvantage to the state?

While Jacob Grebel did not take an inimical attitude toward the Zwinglian creed, he disapproved of Zwingli's interference in political matters and of using the civil government to establish his creed and suppress all dissent. He clearly believed that a church should not, through the state or otherwise, exercise jurisdiction over those who do not voluntarily unite with it. Grebel's proposed policy of general religious toleration, not indeed within the church but within the state, implying the abandonment of all persecution, was in direct opposition to the plans and policies of the state church party of which Zwingli was the head. Hence Jacob Grebel represented the great obstacle in the way of accomplishing what Zwingli conceived to be his life task. Grebel was the head of a political party opposing Zwingli's program of state churchism. He was the leader of the political endeavors against the intolerance of the state church. Jacob Grebel deserves mention among the champions of the principle of liberty of conscience.

In the study of Zwingli's conflict with the tolerant minority in the Council of Zurich we must bear in mind that Zwingli was not only a reformer of the church but a politician and statesman as well. Indeed, when at the height of his power, he was virtually the ruler of the city and canton Zurich.[24] Not without good reason does his monument in Zurich represent him as bearing both the Bible and the sword. It was not so much in the religious as in the political realm that Zwingli undertook to overcome the opposition to the state church type of the Reformation in Zurich. Now, it is needless to say that political ventures often involve temptations to unscrupulousness concerning the measures to be used to obtain a

[24] Cf. Burckhardt, *Huldreich Zwingli*, pp. 52, 57.

desired objective. Never has the compromising nature and inherent weakness of a union of church and state been set into a clearer light than through the manner in which the religiously tolerant minority in the Council of Zurich was overcome to the point of being rendered powerless.

Zwingli's political program was, by the way, amazingly ambitious and comprehensive, including, as it did, not only the Zwinglianization of the canton of Zurich but of all Switzerland and of certain adjoining Roman Catholic states. At a time when there seemed to be danger of war with the Catholic cantons he laid elaborate plans for both defensive and offensive military campaigns including political advice concerning the attitude to be taken by Zurich toward various non-Swiss states. It was apparently early in 1525 that he wrote *"A Plan For A Military Campaign,*[25] looking for conquests and consequent forcible reformation as mentioned above. He had radically abandoned his earlier principles of pacifism.

In passing it may be noted that Zwingli as a statesman was unquestionably a failure. His policy of armed aggression toward the Catholic cantons, was motivated, as just intimated, by the aim of bringing about a religious unity of the Swiss confederacy by overcoming the Catholic cantons in a war of aggression. This policy ended in signal failure. In the ensuing war the military forces of Zurich were completely routed on the battlefield of Cappel (1531) where Zwingli himself, in the prime of life, met his death. Even some of his most prominent associates as reformers, such as Butzer, Vadian and Blaurer, saw in Zwingli's death an indication of divine judgment upon one who used his influence for war instead of peace. Heinrich Bullinger who became Zwingli's successor in Zurich, admitted the dismal failure of his policies and recognized the damaging results in consequence to the cause of the state church. Bullinger profited personally by Zwingli's error. As head of the state church of Zurich he abstained entirely from political activities.

The nobleman Jacob Grebel was, as has been indicated, a senator and political leader of distinction. Both Zwingli and Bullinger stated that he was an influential, highly esteemed councillor.[26] No less than thirty-five times between 1521 and 1525 was Jacob Grebel sent as the official representative of the Council of Zurich to sessions of the *Tagsatzung,* the congress or central or-

---

[25] *Zwinglis Werke,* III, pp. 539-582. Cf. Burckhardt, *Ulrich Zwingli,* pp. 101-122.
[26] *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, p. 781; Bullinger, *Reformationgeschichte,* I, p. 373.

ganization of the Swiss confederacy. In the first period of Zwingli's reformatory labors, before he decided upon the establishment of a state church in which the whole population was to be compelled to hold membership, and before Zwingli came forward with his ambitious political plans, Jacob Grebel was one of his most trusted friends and supporters. "Jacob Grebel," says a contemporary chronicler of Zurich, referring to that period, "aggressively assisted Zwingli in all his endeavors."[27] In August, 1523, Zwingli spoke of him as a man who, on account of his integrity, had his full confidence. In a later period Jacob Grebel expressed the opinion that the reformer of the church should "teach the Gospel and refrain from meddling in politics."

In various letters to Vadian, dating from the years 1525 and 1526, Zwingli complained of the opposition of Jacob Grebel[27a] and of others to whom he referred as "accomplices" of Grebel. He denounced Jacob Grebel and his friends as adversaries of the reformation movement and secret agents of the Roman Church. It was no secret that Grebel disapproved the persecution of those who differed from Zwingli's views. Many others took a similar attitude in this respect. Zwingli finally perceived that unless he could check and overcome the movement headed by Jacob Grebel, the establishment and maintenance of an all-inclusive state church would prove an impossibility. And not only was it apparent that Zwingli's efforts in this direction would fail, but he would lose his station as a political leader as well. The late Professor Rudolf Staehelin, one of the foremost Zwingli scholars, says in his biography of Zwingli that Zwingli considered the victory over Jacob Grebel as absolutely essential to his own existence in Zurich, and that he did not shrink from using any means that would secure for him this victory.[27b] Zwingli finally decided upon an extremely arbitrary act to make himself master of the situation.

In October 1526, he had Jacob Grebel and a few others of his party arrested and tried on the charge of having accepted "pensions" from foreign potentates for favoring the voluntary enlistment of Swiss men in the armies of these potentates, the Swiss being considered the best fighters. Since the year 1503 receiving such "pensions" was unlawful in Zurich. Nevertheless it was an open secret that many received them.[27c] In 1522 a strict mandate

---

27 Staub, *Beziehungen*, p. 42.

27a E. g. *Zwinglis Werke*, VIII, pp. 371, 383, 542.

27b Staehelin, *Huldreich Zwingli*, II, p. 44.

was passed by the Council, demanding punishment for such transgression. Zwingli preached against taking pensions, though he had formerly (in 1519 and 1520) transgressed in this regard, receiving a pension from the pope who was at that time a civil ruler. In a later period ((after 1529) Zwingli openly defended the acceptance of pensions to win the favor of certain foreign potentates.[28]

Jacob Grebel did not deny that he had received pensions, but this had been more than five years before his arrest, namely about the same time when Zwingli was also accepting pensions (previous to the year 1522). Incredible as it may seem, Jacob Grebel was condemned to death on this charge.[29] A venerable old man but well preserved, "with a large snowy beard and snowy hair," as a contemporary chronicler describes him,[30] he was beheaded on October 30, 1526, at the fish market in Zurich.

Jacob Grebel was not condemned to death by the courts of Zurich but by a dictatorial commission, as Zwingli himself speaks of it, consisting of eleven men. For several days during the trial the gates of Zurich were closed to all, except such as had obtained special permission to enter or leave the city. So great was the excitement that Zwingli's friends in Strasburg feared for his life. The sentence of death was executed immediately after it had been pronounced. Bullinger says that Jacob Grebel himself had no thought of the possibility of such a sentence being pronounced until the very hour of his execution, and to the last moment he protested his innocence of any transgression worthy of death. Again, Bullinger states that Jacob Grebel's execution caused a great stir and many did not believe that the charge on which he was condemned was the real cause of his death. He says further: "It was the general opinion that, if he had not been put to death so sudden-

---

[27c] Not only previous to the date when receiving pensions was forbidden by law in Zurich, but later as well (e. g., in 1506 and 1509) pensions were sometimes accepted by the Council as a body and simply divided among the Councillors. (Egli, *Schweiz. Ref. Gesch.,* I, p. 8). For many years the law forbidding pensions was a dead letter.

[28] Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli,* p. 328; Burckhardt, *Huldreich Zwingli,* p. 123; Schweizer, *Gesch. d. Schweiz. Neutralität,* p. 184.

[29] Regarding the trial of and sentence pronounced upon Jacob Grebel cf. *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, 778-783, with important footnotes by Walther Köhler; Farner, *Huldrych Zwinglis Briefe,* II, 248-253; Schweizer, *Geschichte der Schweizerischen Neutralität,* 181-184; Mörikofer, *Ulrich Zwingli,* II, 54-63; Koehler, *Ulrich Zwingli,* 55; Burckhardt, *Huldreich Zwingli,* 94, 95; Beurle, *Der politische Kampf um die religiöse Einheit der Eidgenossenschaft,* 110-112; Koehler, *Ulrich Zwingli und die Reformation in der Schweiz,* 55, 56.

[30] *Bernhard Wyss Chronik,* p. 74.

ly, the sentence would not have been carried out."[31] Precisely so, but were not his judges and antagonists aware of this? The last quoted expression of Bullinger means in plain fact that in the opinion of the people by and large Jacob Grebel had done nothing deserving the death penalty. This is likewise the view of a number of Protestant church historians. It may be observed in passing that Heinrich Bullinger, at the time of Jacob Grebel's death, was a young man of 22, living at Bremgarten, a considerable distance from Zurich. He was unaware of the cause of Grebel's execution.

The way and manner of the suppression of the political anti-state church party in Zurich by Zwingli brought protest from his friends elsewhere. He defended himself in letters to his friends in Basel and Strasburg stating that the cause of the Reformation was at stake and such a course as he had chosen was necessary.[32] Zwingli conceded that he had been the principal accuser of Grebel and had urged the need of severity, since, he says, "these men were to be feared more than the open enemies," that is, those who publicly opposed his religious teaching. Although it was bought too dearly, Zwingli's victory over his political opponents was complete. His opponents on the political field were completely cowed. Nothing stood now in the way of the severest persecution of the Anabaptists.

When a few weeks after Jacob Grebel's execution Felix Manz and George Blaurock fell again into the hands of the authorities of Zurich, Zwingli wrote to Oecolampad in Basel: "I believe the sword will be put to their necks." He was right. Felix Manz was executed by drowning on January 5, 1527. Blaurock escaped the same fate only because he was not a native of the canton Zurich. The sentence which was pronounced over Blaurock demanded that "the executioner shall bind his hands and strip him of his clothing down to the waist, and then lead him out, striking him with rods until the blood flows as he passes along the street from the fish market to the Niederdorf gate." The sentence was carried out on the day of Manz' martyrdom. Zwingli, in his last book against the Brethren mentions that Blaurock was beaten so severely that he was brought "near death's door."[33] We find Blaurock somewhat later in the Swiss cantons of Bern and Appenzell. From May of the year 1529 forward he labored in the Tyrol. On August 14

---

31 *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 373.

32 Compare Zwingli's letter to Oecolampad, *Werke,* VIII, pp. 778-783. Farner, *Huldrych Zwinglis Briefe,* II, pp. 248-253.

33 Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 217.

of the same year he was apprehended at Guffidaun near Clausen in the Tyrol, and after the most cruel tortures was burned alive at the stake on September 6, of the same year.[34]

Among those who witnessed his heroic death and heard his testimony for evangelical truth was Peter Walpot, then a boy of eight years. Walpot from 1565 to 1578 was head pastor of the Hutterian Brethren in Moravia.[35] In one of his hymns Blaurock says, "Blessed are they who in all tribulation cling to Christ to the end," and he adds: "As He himself our sufferings bore, When hanging on the accursed tree, So there is suffering still in store, O pious heart, for you and me."

The death sentence over Felix Manz is an interesting document.[36] Those who are of the opinion that Manz and other Brethren were put to death for causing political disturbances have evidently never read it.[36a] In a hearing given Manz he had made the following statement which was quoted in his death sentence and was laid to his charge as his principal crime, namely: "He and others have undertaken to bring together through Anabaptism such as were minded to accept Christ, to give heed to His word and walk according to it, and leave the others undisturbed in respect to their faith." In other words, he believed that people of various religious creeds could live under one civil government and should be tolerated by the authorities. Felix Manz was condemned to be "handed over to the executioner who shall bind his hands, set him in a boat [on the Limmat River], take him to the lower cabin, tie his hands with his knees between the arms, thrust in a stick between his arms and knees and, thus bound, throw him into the water and let him die and perish."

Bullinger describes the death of this deeply pious man as follows:

> As he was led down from the Wellenberg prison to the fish market and beyond the shambles to the boat, he praised God that he could die for His truth, for, said he, the faith for which he died was right and founded upon the word of God, and Christ had foretold that His followers would suffer for the truth's sake. And this sort of discourse he continued, though he was interrupt-

---

[34] For an account of Blaurock's martyrdom see *Martyr's Mirror*, p. 415. The *Ausbund* has two hymns (Nos. 5 and 20) by Blaurock. The Book of Martyrs has translations of these hymns into prose.

[35] *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder*, p. 41.

[36] Füssli, *Beyträge, IV*, pp. 259-265; Egli, *Actensammlung*, 529 f.

[36a] Even Emil Egli, who is supposed to have been an impartial historian, accused the Brethren of objectionable political activities. (*Züricher Wiedertäufer*, p. 43). Many writers have taken his pertinent statements as historical.

ed and contradicted by the preacher [of the state church] who accompanied him. His mother and brother waited on the way for his coming and encouraged him to be constant and steadfast. When they had reached the cabin and he had been tied and was about to be thrust into the stream by the executioner, he sang with a loud voice, "In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum," [Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit], and forthwith was held under the water by the executioner and drowned.[37]

According to the chronicler Wyss the martyrdom took place at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Bullinger states that the valiant death of Felix Manz impressed many people. The plain fact is that it caused a great sensation. Felix Manz was the first martyr executed by Protestants. The leading reformers, including Zwingli, had at first defended the principle of liberty of conscience and had severely censured the Romish tyranny and persecution. Zwingli felt himself obliged, and was, in fact, called upon to defend this radical departure from his former reformation program. Wolfgang Capito, a Zwinglian reformer of Strasburg, wrote to Zwingli: "It is reported here that Felix Manz of your city has suffered punishment, and died gloriously; on which account the cause of truth and piety which you sustain, is greatly hindered." And again, a few days later, Capito wrote: "I greatly desire to obtain information about the unhappy Felix Manz, whether he suffered punishment on account of transgression or because of obstinacy as regards his religious views, and also about the firmness which he manifested in meeting his death."

The *Ausbund,* the hymn-book of the Swiss Brethren (still in use in the Old Order Amish congregations of America) contains an important hymn of 24 stanzas by Felix Manz. (No. 6). A translation of this hymn (not in verse) is found in the Martyrs Mirror after the account of his martyrdom (English Edition page 400).

What may be the reason, we may properly ask, that church historians in general have far less censure for the execution of the first victims of the intolerance of early state church Protestantism than for later victims, as for example Michael Servetus who has become famous because of his execution with the full consent of John Calvin, twenty-five years after Manz in the Protestant city of Geneva in Switzerland? The plain fact that the martyrdom of Manz and many other Anabaptists has been considered far less

[37] *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 384.

noteworthy than that of Servetus is the more remarkable since the latter was an open opponent of fundamental Christian doctrines, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, while Manz and the Swiss Brethren according to repeated statements of Zwingli, differed from the Zwinglians "only on unimportant outward things."[38] The reason is, obviously, that church historians in general have been slow in recognizing the erroneousness of the assertion, made by the persecutors of the Swiss Brethren, that the latter were punished for revolutionary tendencies and lawlessness, in other words that those of their number who were executed are not to be considered martyrs. One of the latest general church histories in the English language has the following about the Brethren in Zurich: "As early as 1526 (!) the Zurich government had some of them drowned, chiefly on account of their anarchical opinions."[39] It is safe to say, however, that no one who has studied the history of the Brethren from the primary sources still holds such opinions.

The authorities of the canton of Zurich, including Zwingli, were determined not only to suppress the Swiss Brethren movement within their own territory but also to do all in their power to arouse other Protestant states to take similar measures. Zwingli wrote to prominent persons in various cantons and states urging the need of giving this matter more earnest attention. On August 2, 1527, the Council of Zurich, undoubtedly upon Zwingli's suggestion, invited the governments of Bern, Basel, Schaffhausen, Coire, Appenzell, and St. Gall (all the Protestant cantons in Switzerland) to send their delegates to a congress to be held August 11 in Zurich for the purpose of considering what was to be done to uproot Anabaptism. In the letter sent to these governments the Council stated that in the territory of Zurich even the severest measures had failed to check the movement, and that they had learned of the continuous spread of Anabaptism in other states. The Zurich Council also addressed the magistrates of the cities of Ulm and Augsburg in a similar way.

The proposed meeting was held on the date mentioned. The governments of Zurich, Bern and St. Gall agreed upon a concordat defining and prescribing unified action to be taken to suppress Anabaptism. In consequence the three governments published a mandate in which they referred to Anabaptism as a "vice," (*Laster*) "an un-Christian malicious, offensive and seditious weed" (*Unkraut*) which must be destroyed. Leaders and ministers and those

[38] *Zwinglis Werke,* III, p. 406, 872.

[39] Clarke, *History of the Christian Church,* p. 274.

who once had promised to obey the religious orders of the government should be put to death without further ceremony. All others should be admonished to recant, and if they refused, they should also suffer the death penalty. Every citizen was under duty to report to the authorities all persons who were under suspicion of being Anabaptists.[39a]

An indirect cause for the spread of Anabaptism was brought to the attention of the authorities of Zurich through the first synod of the clergy of the Zurich state church, held after Easter of 1528. Some of the Zwinglian ministers were found guilty of gross transgression by the synod. The pastor of Steinmaur was dismissed for adultery. The people of the parish of Wetzikon stated in a petition that their pastor was a backbiter and a thief, those of Wangen reported that their minister was a drinker and a gambler. Another pastor was accused by his flock of mercilessly beating his wife. Concerning the pastor of Stallikon it was reported that he was a drunkard, "but is otherwise a dear, good man and has promised to do better." The preachers of Russikon, Wildberg, Zell, and Turbenthal were found guilty of drunkenness and fighting. The pastor of Bärentschwiel was convicted of saying that he had taken a wife upon the command of the Council (all the former priests having been ordered to marry), and if they so desired, he would take a second one.[40]

If discipline could have been practiced in the state church—if this had been possible—such conditions could not have prevailed. There are many indications of deplorable moral conditions. Heinrich Bullinger, somewhat later, complains bitterly of profanity even among the clergy. He says:

> The Anabaptists are not out of place, when they hear any one curse and swear, to reprove him saying that it is contrary to God. There is no doubt that people in general [the rank and file of the state church membership] sin very grievously against God by their frequent wicked, yea devilish swearing. And it is in our time not only the rude men of war who swear, but also the commoners and craftsmen, yea the preachers themselves, the wives and daughters and children. And this cursed, devilish custom of swearing is indulged in to such extent . . . that many use a swear word with almost every word they speak. Consider now

---

39a The document is printed in full by Simler, *Sammlungen z. K.-Gesch.*, I, pp. 449-458.

40 Egli, *Züricher Wiedertäufer*, p. 75f; Egli, *Actensammlung*, pp. 603-610, 621-623; cf. Burrage, *A History of the Anabaptists in Switzerland*, p. 189. On this subject see further, Burckhardt, *Basler Täufer*, p. 108; Bächtold, *Schaffhauser Täufer*, p. 107f; Müller, *Bernische Täufer*, pp. 82-85.

> for God's sake to what a pass things have come in these latter times, and that at no other time [not in the time when Romanism held sway] God was blasphemed more ferociously than at the present time.[41]

This is a frank acknowledgment of deplorable conditions in the state church on the one hand and of the religious zeal and earnestness of the Swiss Brethren, on the other.

As indicated above, in the principality of Grüningen, in the Canton Zurich, where the Brethren were numerous, the judges, notwithstanding the most urgent orders from the Zurich Council, persistently refused to condemn any one to death for his faith. The judges appealed to a particular privilege granted this principality by the House of Hapsburg giving them the right of pardoning criminals (and heretics) that were considered guilty of death. Two ministers of the Brethren, Jacob Falk and Heinrich Reimann were kept imprisoned in Grüningen for a long period in spite of insistent demands by the Council of Zurich for their execution according to the mandates. The judges of Grüningen tried to compromise by sentencing them to imprisonment for life, but the Zurich Council insisted on execution by drowning. They finally agreed with the Grüningen authorities to submit the difficulty to the Council of Bern for arbitration. However, even after the Bern Council had decided in favor of Zurich, the authorities of Grüningen nevertheless, instead of executing the two men, handed them over to the Council of Zurich. The two ministers of the Brethren, remained steadfast to the end and were put to death by drowning in the Limmat River on September 5, 1528. In the archives of Zurich there is kept a brief account of a hearing given Jacob Falk. He refused to give the names of those he had baptized; "he would not be the cause of the persecution and death of his brethren," he said. To the question who had encouraged him to steadfastness, he replied: "No one has encouraged and comforted me except the Son of God who has redeemed me and will not forsake me."[42]

Many imprisoned members of the Swiss Brethren Church in the principality of Grüningen were delivered up to the Council of Zurich in September, 1528. Some of them had been imprisoned for a year and fifteen weeks. Among them were Heinrich Karpfis and Hans Hotz who later, in 1538, was one of the principal spokesmen of the Brethren in the great disputation held at Bern. All of

---

[41] *Widertoufferen ursprung,* p. 179a.

[42] Egli, *Actensammlung,* No. 1483.

the prisoners confessed that they had exhorted each other, sick or well, in the dungeon at Grüningen, to steadfastness. One of them had lain half a year in the dungeon, sick and was swollen from his feet to his neck, so that he had to be carried; yet he preferred to die with his companions in the dungeon rather than to be taken to the castle to die.[43] In Zurich they all were placed in separate prisons.

Toward the end of the year 1529 Hans Müller of Medicon in the Aar valley was imprisoned. "I would ask you," he wrote to the Council of Zurich, "that you would not burden my conscience, since faith is a free gift of God; I implore you, ye servants of God, to grant me liberty for my faith."

Conrad Winkler, another minister of the Brethren, was executed by drowning in Zurich, January 20, 1530. In his death sentence it is stated that he was "for a long time a prominent leader" of this sect.[44] He had successfully labored in many places, particularly in the canton of Basel where in June, 1528, he was apprehended and sentenced to the pillory and to be beaten with rods while led through the streets of the city. This sentence was carried out. When he suffered martyrdom in Zurich, he rejoiced and sang with a clear voice one or two verses of a psalm.[45] Two Brethren, Heinrich Karpfis and Hans Herzog were executed in Zurich on March 23, 1532.

Zwingli's struggle with the Swiss Brethren was far more intense and risky than his conflict with the Roman Church. He himself said that the latter was child's play compared with the former. He ventured upon a life-and-death struggle with the political party which demanded the toleration of the Brethren. To all appearance this party would have won in the struggle for liberty of conscience, had not the execution of Jacob Grebel been carried out with extraordinary swiftness. The Anabaptist movement, by the way, showed greater inherent strength in other parts of Switzerland, in particular in the canton Bern, than in Zurich.

---

[43] *Ibid.*, No. 1486.

[44] Egli, *Actensammlung,* No. 1637.

[45] Füssli, *Beyträge,* IV, p. 121.

THE AMISH MENNONITES OF UNION COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

John Umble

II. A HISTORY OF THE SETTLEMENT

Although Amish settlers from Lancaster and Berks counties had reached Mifflin county as early as 1791 and 1792 and Union county settlements had already reached a high state of development in 1810, with land selling at twenty-five dollars per acre, no Amish church organization seems to have existed along the banks of Buffalo Creek in Union county until a number of Lancaster county families moved into the valley in 1836. A Stutzman family[1] had emigrated from Berks county to Juniata county, Pennsylvania, as early as 1808 and had already removed from there to Fairfield county, Ohio (1835), before the Union county congregation was organized. The Amish did not settle in Fairfield county, however, until the Ohio canals were completed. Tradition states that the early Union county settlers had made the trip from Lancaster county in a canal boat. Pennsylvania canals were opened in 1834. Cheap transportation and better markets as a result of the canals may have furnished the incentive for the emigration of Lancaster county families to Union county and the removal of several Mifflin county families to the same place in the years between 1835 and 1850. Most of the latter had gone to Mifflin from Lancaster and Berks counties between 1790 and 1820.

As early as 1778 Leonard Groninger, a Hollander, was taken prisoner by the Indians near Lewisburg, and Leonard Groninger, Sr., died in Buffalo Valley in 1786. Even before the Revolutionary War the government had made land grants to prospective settlers within the present limits of Union county. The farm acquired by John Plank and John Lapp in West Buffalo township in 1838 was first granted on March 22, 1774. Some of the later grants seem to have been made to officers and soldiers of the Revolution. The tracts purchased by Christian Stoltzfus and Christian King in Kelly

[1] John Stutzman, born November 17, 1785 in Berks county, Pennsylvania, died November 29, 1864, in Fairfield county, Ohio. His wife was Barbara Hertzler, daughter of Jacob Hertzler, Jr., son of Jacob Hertzler, the immigrant.

township in 1836 and 1851, respectively, had been granted to Captain Jacob Kern in 1783 and to the Rev. William Smith, D. D., in 1791.

At an early date land brought a much higher price in Union county than Amish or Mennonites later paid on the Ohio frontier. Peter Kauffman of Northumberland county (located just east of the Susquehanna river from Union county), paid twenty-seven hundred and thirty-three dollars for one hundred eighteen acres in West Buffalo township, Union county, on March 28, 1810, while Andrew Miller, a mason, paid five hundred dollars for twenty-six acres in the same county on February 5, 1814. In the fourth decade of the century, when the main body of Amish settled in the county, most of them paid twenty to thirty dollars per acre. The fifth decade had scarcely begun before some of the new-comers paid forty.

According to tradition the Union county, Pennsylvania, Amish settlement was founded by Samuel Lantz of Leacock township (also spelled Lacock and Laycock in the Union county records), Lancaster county, and six of his sons-in-law. It is practically certain, however, that a number of his daughters were married after the family moved to Union county. And it is established, too, that several other Amish householders purchased land there at the same time that Lantz and some of his sons-in-law did. According to an obituary in the *Herald of Truth* (April, 1875), a certain John P. Knepp was born in Union county. He died in Johnson county, Iowa, January, 1875, at the age of fifty-six and one-half years. If this record is accurate he was born in Union county in 1818. He united with the Amish church in Mifflin county, Pennsylvania, and moved to Johnson county, Iowa, in 1851.

John Byler, "yeoman" of Henderson township, Huntingdon county, Pennsylvania (a few miles west of Allensville, Mifflin county), purchased one hundred eighty-one acres of Union county land for fifty-four hundred dollars cash on April 12, 1836. On the same day he seems to have purchased three hundred forty-nine acres for fifty-four hundred dollars. The next year Christian Lantz (his wife's name was Leah) from Leacock township, Lancaster county, paid eight thousand dollars for one hundred fifty-eight acres in the same county. Four days after Christian Lantz's purchase, John Lantz of Turbot township, Northumberland county, and Jonathan Lantz of White Deer township, Union county, purchased two hundred sixty-one acres in the latter township for five thousand dollars. John Planck of Menno township, Mifflin county, and John Lapp paid seven thousand and sixty dollars and fifty cents for one hundred thirteen acres in West Buffalo township in the following year

(April 10, 1838). These purchases may indicate that tradition errs in ascribing to Samuel Lantz and his sons-in-law the honor of founding the settlement and the congregation.[2]

The Plancks and Lantzes, however, with the exception of Samuel, seem to have removed to Mifflin county, Pennsylvania, somewhat later, and none of them is remembered as a resident of Union county by survivors of the second and third generation. Even tradition seems to have forgotten them.

The principal families in Union county, or at least those who seem to have had most to do with shaping its history, were: Samuel Lantz and his wife Magdalena with six of their daughters and sons-in-law; John (Hannes) Beiler and family; Jacob Beiler, brother of Hannes, and family; Bishop Solomon Yoder and family; and the John and Jacob Riehl families. Of considerable importance, also, were the families: Michael Schwartz, Stephen Kurtz, Christian Kauffman, Abraham Esch, Zook, Kanagy, King, and at least one other Esch family, relatives of the Beilers.

Samuel Lantz purchased one hundred thirteen acres in East Buffalo township on April 5, 1837. The husband of Lantz's eldest daughter, Susanna, was Christian Stoltzfus, "yeoman," of Leacock township, Lancaster county. He had purchased one hundred fifty-five acres in Kelly township, Union county, for sixty-six hundred dollars in cash two days earlier (April 2, 1837). A month after Lantz and Stoltzfus made their first purchase in Union county in 1837, Samuel Glick of Leacock township, Lancaster county, paid sixty-six hundred dollars for one hundred ninety-four acres in Buffalo township (May 8, 1837). About 1850 when Samuel Lantz's will was filed for probate in Union county the following sons-in-law were resident there: Samuel Glick, the executor of Samuel Lantz's last will and testament (wife, Barbara); Christian Stoltzfus (wife, Susanna); David Glick (wife, Magdalena, named for her mother); Isaac Walker (Catherine—she signed it Chatarine); Elias Riehl (Fannie, who signed herself "freni" [*sic*]; and Joel Riehl, widower (whose deceased wife, Anna, had left one surviving child, John). Although some of these sisters may not have been married at the time that Samuel Lantz and Christian Stoltzfus settled in Union county, they, with their families, and the John Byler family men-

[2]The purchase of land is not proof of residence, to be sure. John Lapp (wife, Elizabeth), however, was living in Buffalo township, Union county, on March 18, 1845. But on August 16, 1864, a certain John Lapp (wife, Catherine), of Leacock township, Lancaster county, sold a lot in Lewisburg, Union county, for nine hundred dollars. These two Lapps might have been the same person. And John Lapp might have been a son of Michael Lapp, brother-in-law of Christian Stoltzfus.

tioned above, became, in a very real sense, the nucleus of the later Union county Amish congregation. Samuel Lantz's only surviving son, Christian, and his daughter, Elizabeth (Mrs. Christian Yost), seem never to have lived in Union county. At any rate they resided in Lancaster county at the time of their father's death.

Study of a number of frontier Amish and Mennonite communities instructs the historian to be on the lookout for ties of blood and other relationship among such groups of early settlers. Samuel Lantz was a step-son of Bishop Christian Stoltzfus, the grandfather of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus. The John Planck mentioned above may have been a relative of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, whose mother was Mary Plank, daughter of Bishop John Plank (Hannes Blank). On April 5, 1843, Michael and Christian Plank purchased, jointly, sixty acres in West Buffalo township for twenty-eight hundred dollars. A certain John Plank paid five thousand dollars for a tract of land in Kelly township, August 29, 1849. None of the Planks or Lantzes, however, as stated above, were living in the settlement during the close of its history. About 1843 a Christian and a Jonathan Lantz were among the group that founded an Amish settlement in Knox county, Ohio, where Isaac Schmucker (later a bishop in Noble county, Indiana) was ordained to the ministry.

The large family of John Byler (always called Hannes) lived on the Furnace Road on the southern limits of the settlement. Nearly all of them resided there at one time but not during the last twenty or thirty years of the life of the colony. Four farms south of the "Byler Graveyard" belonged to him and his children. Beginning at the east, Hannes himself and his wife lived in the "Grossdady" house and Eli Byler on the farm. Eli died and was buried in the Byler graveyard about 1862. The next farm toward the west was the home of Hannes' daughter, Betsy, and her husband, the widower, Joel Riehl, the brother of Bishop Elias Riehl. Josiah Byler lived on the next farm and Samuel on the one farthest west. Samuel Byler (he seems to have spelled it Beiler) died in Union county in 1866 at the age of forty-three. His wife, who died thirteen years earlier, was the daughter of the pioneer, Samuel Glick, Sr. His daughter, Barbara Byler, became the wife of David Smucker.[3] Hannes Byler's sons, Mike and Jonathan, probably also lived in Union county, but his son Abe probably did not. Hannes'

[3] David Smucker and his wife were among the last Amish Mennonites to leave the colony. They moved from Vicksburg to Belleville about 1894, where they and a married son and daughter still reside. The son's wife is Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' granddaughter.

son, Jonathan Byler, resided in Noble county, Indiana, in later years. Two of his daughters were married to Bishop Jonathan Kurtz of Topeka, Indiana, and Preacher John Kauffman of West Liberty, Ohio, respectively. One of Hannes Byler's daughters married a Michael Plank. They moved from Union county, Pennsylvania, to St. Joseph county, Michigan, and from there to Cass county, Missouri, where they both died. Another daughter married a Mifflin county Peachey. She was the mother of Samuel W. Peachey.

This Hannes Byler may have been the John Byler of Henderson township, Huntingdon county, who purchased a farm of three hundred forty-nine acres in 1836, the year before Samuel Lantz and Christian Stoltzfus moved to Union county. This may have been the John Byler, also, who, jointly with Christian Stoltzfus, purchased one hundred acres in Buffalo township on Buffalo Creek and the Lewisburg-Mifflinburg Road on April 7, 1838. The residence of both on that date is given in the deed as Buffalo township, Union county. Hence the tradition that Christian Stoltzfus had always lived in Kelly township after he moved to Union county appears to be an error.

The colony received several important accessions, not only from Lancaster county, but also from Mifflin. Christian Kauffman, farmer, born in Mifflin county, March 6, 1807, was living in Union county during the forties, but removed to Mercer county, Pennsylvania, before 1853 and eventually to Lawrence county, where his widow, Martha Kurtz, resided about 1880. Christian Kauffman's thirteen children became the progenitors of a numerous family in Lawrence county, Pennsylvania. Many of his descendants removed to Ohio and Missouri.

Also of permanent importance to Union county Amish history was the removal to Union county of Jacob Beiler (Byler), brother of Hannes Byler from Mifflin county about 1840. Jacob Beiler was the father of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' second wife, Lydia. Beiler's wife, Elizabeth Hertzler, was a cousin to the above-mentioned Christian Kauffman's mother-in-law, Veronica (Hertzler) Kurtz. In 1792 another of Elizabeth Hertzler's cousins, Jacob Hertzler, had moved to Mifflin county, Pennsylvania, from Caernarvon township, Berks county, Pennsylvania, where strong anti-German and anti-Tory feeling existed following the Revolutionary War. His son, Jacob Hartzler, Jr., illustrates the farther westward movement of population. This son moved from Mifflin county, Pennsylvania, to Fairfield county, Ohio, in 1834, and to Champaign county, Ohio,

in 1846, where he died a bishop in the Amish church.[4] Rebecca, the cousin of the bishop, Jacob Hertzler, Jr., became the wife of David Kanagy and the mother of Bishop Jacob C. Kanagy of Logan county, Ohio (and later, Cass county, Missouri). This Rebecca (Hertzler) Kanagy died near Vicksburg, Union county, Pennsylvania, prior to 1880. Her daughter, Barbara, married Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' son, Isaac, and with her husband became one of the founders of the Lyon county, Kansas, Amish Mennonite settlement in the eighties.

Elizabeth Hertzler moved from Mifflin county to Union county with her husband, Jacob Beiler, when he was already about sixty. With characteristic caution, Jacob Beiler seems to have rented a farm in Buffalo township before settling permanently, but on April 6, 1842, he purchased two hundred eighty acres in Kelly township for ninety-six hundred dollars. One of his sons, Emmanuel [*sic*], remained in Mifflin and reared a family there. A son-in-law, John Peachey, husband of Nancy Beiler, may have resided in Union county for a time, but returned to Mifflin county where many of his descendants still reside. He and Jacob Beiler, Jr., were executors of Jacob Beiler's will when he died in 1849, aged seventy. Jacob Beiler's sons, Jacob and John H. Byler, were born in Lancaster county before their father moved to Mifflin county about 1818. Both lived in Union county until about 1865 when they removed to Lancaster county where their descendants still reside. Jacob was born in Lancaster county, December 5, 1809, and married Nancy Hertzler in 1837. His son David H. Beiler, who died in Lancaster county in 1889, was born in Union county, July 22, 1848, but moved to Lancaster county with his father. His wife was Fanny Miller, born February 9, 1852, in Lancaster county, daughter of Christian and Lydia (Stoltzfus) Miller. Jacob Beiler's daughter, Rebecca, born in Union county in 1846, married Joel Zook, the Lancaster county Amish Mennonite Preacher, who was born in Mifflin county in 1847.

John H. Byler, or John Byler, Jr., as he signs his name to a legal document in 1853, and his sister, Lydia, lived at home with their mother from the time of the death of their father, Jacob, in 1849 until the death, in 1853, of their mother, Elizabeth (Hertzler) Beiler. After that they seem to have kept up the old home until March, 1855, when both were married: Lydia, on March 6,

[4] For some reason Jacob Hertzler, Jr., began to spell his name Hartzler in Fairfield county. The name is now so spelled by numerous descendants of the Fairfield county, Ohio, Hartzlers, living in western Ohio near West Liberty, in northern Indiana near Topeka, and in Cass county, Missouri.

at the age of thirty-five to the widower, Christian Stoltzfus as already noted, and John H., on March 28, at the age of forty to Charity Riehl, born February 20, 1832, in Center county, Pennsylvania.

A third John Byler, John L., lived in Union county during the fifties. He seems to have been a cousin of John H. Byler, and Lydia (Byler) Stoltzfus.[5] He was born in Mifflin county in 1827, moved to Union county after 1850, returned to Mifflin county after 1860 and died there 1866. Two of his daughters, Mrs. Eri Yoder, widow of Preacher Rufus Yoder, West Liberty, Ohio, and Mrs. Hannah Plank, widow of Samuel H. Plank, reside in Goshen, Indiana. Mrs. Eri Yoder is the mother of Mary (Yoder) Burkhard, the missionary, whose husband, Jacob Burkhard, died in India and lies buried "under the mango tree."

King and Kanagy were other names among the earlier settlers. The obituary of Mrs. John King (Nancy Kanagy) who died near Haw Patch, Lagrange county, Indiana, in 1892, states that she and her husband were married in Union county, Pennsylvania, in 1841 and lived together for over fifty years. She is buried near Topeka, Indiana, in the Maple Grove Cemetery. John King, however, was born in Center county, Pennsylvania.

Two other important early families were the Riehls and Yoders. Bishop Solomon Yoder may have been the first bishop in the settlement. He was born in 1800 (hence was three years older than Deacon Christian Stoltzfus), in Windsor township, Berks county, Pennsylvania. His wife was Frances Riehl, born in Chester county, Pennsylvania, in 1804. His sister, Lovina, married John Riehl, the brazier and blacksmith, who was a brother of Frances Riehl (Mrs. Solomon Yoder), a Riehl brother and sister marrying, therefore, a Yoder sister and brother. Bishop Solomon Yoder's son, Lewis, the Baltimore county, Maryland, minister, was born in Union county in 1846. Bishop Yoder was still living in Union county in 1849 when he signed Jacob Beiler's will as a witness, but he seems soon afterward to have moved to Baltimore county, Maryland, where his wife died, August 20, 1868. John Riehl and Frances (Riehl) Yoder had a brother, Jacob, whose son, John, was a minister. Jacob, a son of Preacher John Riehl, died of tuberculosis

---

[5] This surmise is based on a family tradition. The children of John L. Byler and of Lydia (Beiler) Stoltzfus always considered each other second cousins, hence their parents were no doubt first cousins. Mrs. Lizzie Hooley thinks that her grandfather, Hannes Beiler, and John L. Beiler's father (name unknown) were first cousins.

in Union county in 1869 leaving a wife and three small children. Two of these children are John and Jonas Riehl, now of Leetonia, Ohio.

Like many other Amish of the early period in Pennsylvania, Solomon and Lovina Yoder were born in Berks county and moved to Mifflin with their parents early in the century. Lovina married John Riehl in Mifflin county about 1815; they reared their family there and in 1850 moved to Union county with several children. Her sons, Elias and Joel, mentioned above as among the sons-in-law of Samuel Lantz, had preceded the other members of the family to Union county. John Riehl died in 1864. When his wife, Lovina (Yoder) Riehl, died June 21, 1879, at the age of eighty-nine, she left ten children: the two sons, Elias and Joel, and eight daughters, Sallie, Katie, Rebecca, Lovina, Hannah (Mrs. Stephen Kurtz), Fanny (wife of Preacher Andrew Miller), Elizabeth (Mrs. Samuel Kennel), and Barbara (Mrs. John O. Miller). Fanny and Elizabeth were twins. An unmarried daughter, Mattie, preceded her mother in death.

John O. Miller and Andrew were brothers who moved to Union county from Maryland. Andrew had been ordained a minister in the Amish Mennonite church in Maryland prior to his removal to Union county in 1869. He had operated a flour mill in Maryland, but took up farming exclusively in Pennsylvania. Preacher Andrew Miller rented land until 1875. For at least one year prior to 1875 he lived on the Deacon Christian Stoltzfus homestead near Kelly Point. Samuel Kennel, "yeoman," also moved to Union county from Maryland in 1869 and purchased a farm near Vicksburg in 1871. John O. Miller had preceded his brother and brother-in-law to Union county in 1860.

By 1870 the colony had assumed the proportions and the religious, social, and economic tone by which it is remembered by the surviving members of the congregation.

The families of the congregation, as already indicated, were widely scattered. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus and his married sons (except John who lived farther south near Vicksburg) and his daughters (except Susie, wife of Christian Zook in Chester county) owned large prosperous homesteads in Kelly township north of Buffalo Creek. Near the southern limits of the county Bishop Elias Riehl (incorrectly spelled Reele in the Union county records), on April 1, 1842, had purchased for thirty-six hundred dollars from his father-in-law, Samuel Lantz, the farm of one hundred thirteen acres in East Buffalo township which Lantz had purchased five years earlier. This farm Bishop Elias Riehl no longer occupied in

1870. He had sold it to his brother Joel and lived on a smaller farm a mile or two west of Lewisburg on the Lewisburg-Mifflinburg pike.

Near Riehl lived the widow of Abraham Esch with the last two of her beautiful and popular daughters. One of them, Mary, became the wife of John A. Umble, of Gap, Lancaster county, and one, Lydia, married Jonathan, youngest son of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus by his first marriage. Lydia (Esch) Stoltzfus became the mother of Preacher Ammon Stoltzfus, of Woodriver, Nebraska, and the grandmother of Preacher Nicholas Stoltzfus, of Manson, Iowa. Another Esch sister, Catharine (born in Union county, July 5, 1853), married Stephen K. Mast, of Morgantown, Pennsylvania. Abraham Esch seems to have been one of the earlier settlers. While the father was still living the family lived near the present site of Vicksburg. At least one other Esch family was resident in Union county prior to 1840.

Bishop Riehl's brother, Joel, the death of whose first wife (Anna Lantz) was mentioned above, also owned a farm near Vicksburg. His second wife was the gifted Betsy Beiler, daughter of Hannes Beiler, the pioneer. The married sisters of the Riehl brothers, Mrs. Andrew Miller, Mrs. John O. Miller, Mrs. Samuel Kennel also lived on farms south and east of Vicksburg. Here lived also John Stoltzfus, son of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, and two of the Glicks, Samuel and David, after whom Glick's schoolhouse was named. John Glick owned a farm near Mifflinburg in West Buffalo township. Mrs. Hannah (Riehl) Kurtz, widow of Stephen Kurtz who died in 1869, and her family lived north of Vicksburg midway between the group just mentioned and the Stoltzfzus farms north of Buffalo Creek. Near Mrs. Kurtz lived the Bishop-Deacon Michael Schwartz, owner and operator of a grist mill and saw mill, and near by, his son Jacob, husband of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' daughter, Magdalene.

Geographically, therefore, the group lacked the solidarity requisite for building up a cohesive community spirit or for locating a convenient place for public worship. The colony lay in the form of two lines, irregularly parallel, ten or twelve miles apart. The longest line, that on the south, extended from a point two miles west of Mifflinburg, a distance of six or eight miles. A shorter line, on the north, began at the farm of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus north of Buffalo Creek just north of Hoffa's, now Weaver's, mill and stretched away eastward for several miles toward the Susquehanna river. Two families, those of Mrs. Hannah Kurtz and Michael Schwartz resided midway between on the Smoketown Hill

where Michael Schwartz owned and operated a grist-mill and saw-mill. Schwartz's home was a mile west of the Salem Evangelical church. The Kurtz family lived near him on the east.

This beautiful agricultural section presents no answer to the question: Why did this Amish settlement, begun so auspiciously in the thirties, become extinct in the eighties? The fertile rolling acres north of Buffalo Creek produced an abundant crop of fruit and grain in 1932. The farm in Kelly township owned by Deacon Christian Stoltzfus from 1836 until his death in 1883, and by his heirs for several years after that, is in a high state of cultivation. The buildings are well kept, and the gently-sloping northeast field received an application of lime in the summer of 1932. Over on the Lewisburg-Mifflinburg turnpike, also, the appearance of the many fine farms indicates in spite of the economic depression and an unusually dry summer (1932), a high degree of rural prosperity, happiness, and contentment.

The answer to the above question is not related to economics; it is to be found rather in the story of the internal discord among the members. The details of the beginning of strife have, happily, not been recorded, but the later years of bitter conflict that eventuated into the complete disruption of the colony remain all too vividly in the memories of surviving members of the once flourishing congregation.

Little is known of the early history of the settlement beyond the few bare facts of settlement. As stated above, Solomon Yoder was probably the first bishop, but the evidence is largely negative. The bishop's sons, Solomon and Lewis, were born in Union county, on June 13, 1837, and in 1846, respectively. Solomon Yoder and Christian Stoltzfus signed Jacob Beiler's will as witnesses in June, 1849. Who the first ministers were is not known. Possibly John Lapp or Preacher Riehl. Complete organization of an Amish congregation would require a bishop, one or more ministers and a deacon. Christian Stoltzfus was ordained in 1839 and served the congregation in that capacity until his death in 1883.

Deacon Christian Stoltzfus numbered many Amish bishops, preachers, and deacons among his relatives. Both of his grandfathers were bishops: Christian Stoltzfus and John Plank (Hannes Blank). A relative, Barbara Stoltzfus, married Michael Swartz, an Amish bishop-deacon, who lived in Union county and who, because he occasionally preached, is sometimes incorrectly referred to as Preacher Michael Swartz. He outlived his wife who died in Union county in 1866 in her seventy-seventh year. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' sister, Barbara, married Michael Lapp, an Amish

deacon; his brother, John Stoltzfus, was an Amish Mennonite bishop, one of the founders of the Concord, Tennessee, Amish Mennonite settlement; and his brother Jacob was an Amish minister—a "Diener zum Buch."

Two of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' sons-in-law were ordained to the ministry. The husband of the deacon's eldest daughter Mary (or Maria, but usually called Marily—accent on the second syllable) was Preacher Christian King of Leacock township, Lancaster county. On April 1, 1851, he purchased one hundred twenty acres in Union county near his father-in-law's farm. Several years later he was ordained to the ministry, and was finally ordained bishop in Lancaster county after his return there. The second of the deacon's sons-in-law to be ordained was David Stoltzfus, husband of Lizzie, the deacon's second daughter by his second marriage. David was ordained in 1883 just a few months before the death of his father-in-law. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' two sons by his second marriage, Bishop Eli B. Stoltzfus and Preacher B. B. Stoltzfus, were ordained Mennonite ministers near West Liberty, Ohio, within the present century. The deacon's grandson, Ammon Stoltzfus, Woodriver, Nebraska, and his great-grandson, Nicholas Stoltzfus, Manson, Iowa, are Mennonite preachers. A number of the descendants of Christian's son, Jacob, who live in Lancaster county have been chosen for the ministry.

Deacon Christian Stoltzfus was the father of eleven children by his first wife, Susanna Lantz, and seven by his second wife, Lydia Beiler. Seven of the children of Susanna (Lantz) Stoltzfus were married and living in Union county in 1880. These with their families and the deacon's sons and daughters by his second marriage made up an important part of the congregation.

Little is known of the earlier settlers, but the pioneer Jacob Beiler is said to have been very strict not only in parental discipline, but also in demanding close adherence to the customs of the church. In his declining years he required his daughter, Lydia, second wife of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, to read the Scriptures to him for hours at a time. From this practice, no doubt, she acquired the habit of reading the New Testament and the Psalms aloud. As she grew older and while she was living at Hartford, Kansas, with her daughter, Nancy (Mrs. Frank Umble), few Sunday afternoons passed that did not find her in her private room reading aloud from the Book of Books. Years of practice had developed her reading into a rich melodious chant, rhythmically beautiful but awe-inspiring. More than once the distant sound of this chant brought a hush of Sabbath stillness over her grandchildren. She could not tolerate

whistling or loud boisterous conversation on Sunday, but gained respect for her wishes by kindness and gentleness rather than querulous fault-finding. In many ways her children enjoyed greater freedom than usually allowed to children in Amish homes of that day. She encouraged education and Sunday school attendance in a quiet way. One of her gifts to her eldest grandson was an illustrated German primer. Never having learned so much as to write her name, she attempted to learn to write after her children were grown so that she might correspond with them after they left home, but she was not successful. Like many other women of that period she made her mark in signing legal documents.

The earliest actual records concerning the religious activities of the Union county ministers occur in the minutes of the Annual Amish Conference held at various places from 1862 to 1878. Bishop Solomon Yoder, a resident of Maryland at that time, attended the first Amish Conference in Wayne county, Ohio, in 1862. He was elected moderator of this conference, but declined to serve. He attended the second conference (1863) and took an active part in the deliberations of the seventh annual conference held near Belleville, Pennsylvania, in the spring of 1868. The Union county "bench" was well-represented at the first (1862) conference. Bishop Elias Riehl, Preacher Christian King, and Deacon Christian Stoltzfus attended the conference. Preacher Christian King seems never to have attended after the first conference. Christian Stoltzfus, as well as his brother John of Pequea, Lancaster county, was present at the second conference and served on a council or committee appointed to bring in a recommendation on a question of church polity relating to divorce. Christian Stoltzfus seems never to have attended a conference after the second. At this second conference the Union county congregation seems to have been considered as supporting the party of Solomon Beiler in Mifflin county in his controversy with Abraham Pitsche over the adoption of a more liberal policy in church government and discipline. It seems likely that neither Deacon Christian Stoltzfus nor his son-in-law Preacher Christian King were in full harmony with the attitude of conference in exercising patience and following a middle course in dealing with those who were beginning to demand relief from the strict Amish discipline of an earlier period.

Study of the conference reports discloses, however, that Bishop Elias Riehl was an important figure at the annual meetings of the Amish Mennonite ministers. He was the respected co-laborer of such outstanding leaders as John K. Yoder, John P. King, Samuel Yoder, Joseph Stuckey, John Smith, Sebastian Gerig, Jonathan

Zook, Joseph Schlegel and others under whose progressive policies the Amish Mennonite church in America gradually enlarged her horizon, provided for the religious instruction of her young people, and conserved the best energy and thought of the church during the troublesome sixties and seventies. During those first years of conference the method of procedure called, first, for the raising of practical questions of discipline or doctrine; second, the appointment of a "Rath", that is, a council or committee to discuss behind closed doors each question presented; third, a recommendation to conference, by the "Rath" (pronounced "Rote"); fourth, open discussion of the recommendation by the conference, and finally a vote by the conference. Sometimes, also, conference was petitioned for help in settling difficulties between, or within, congregations. Conference usually appointed committees to settle such difficulties and report the next year.

Bishop Riehl was called on many times to act on an important "Rath." About 1870 he was frequently appointed chairman of these deliberative committees. He seems never to have brought in a decision that was not adopted unanimously by conference. On at least five occasions he served on important committees for settling disputes between congregations or ministers of the same congregation. Divorce, temperance reform, definition of the duties of the deacon (Almosenpfleger-Amt), shunning, political activity of church members, business connections of Amish Mennonites, and similar questions were assigned to committees of which he was a member. At the 1873 conference he was chairman of the first committee to consider the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages by Amish Mennonite church members. He had the courage to bring in a resolution unqualifiedly condemning such manufacture and sale and then made such a vigorous defense of the resolution that it was unanimously adopted. Appointed on a committee apparently intended to prohibit Amish Mennonites from engaging in business, he and his colleagues had the courage and foresight to bring in a mild resolution merely pointing out the dangers to spiritual life, involved in business pursuits. The resolution did not satisfy the radicals, but after a lengthy discussion it, too, was adopted unanimously.

Bishop Riehl, however, was not a liberal. During the heated campaign of General Grant, in 1868, when the conference met at Belleville, Pennsylvania, he scornfully rejected the implication that it might be permitted to allow Christians to attend circuses, shows, political campaign rallies, and flag-pole raisings, and demanded that the brotherhood guard against taking too active a part "in

the present so-called political battle of ballots." He staunchly defended the devotional head covering for women, and insisted that the whole head should be covered, not half of it. The Lord's commandments, he asserted, should not be half-kept, but wholly and perfectly.

On occasions when so many of the prominent members of conference were absent from the public assembly in private committee meetings that business was interrupted, it was the custom for the moderator to call on some minister to address the large crowd in attendance at these conferences. Bishop Riehl was in demand at such times, if he happened not to be engaged in committee duty himself. He led in the opening prayer of the first conference in 1862. Several times he was called on to preach what would now be called the conference sermon. Tall and commanding in appearance, trained as a school teacher, clear and forceful as a speaker, he was considered one of the better preachers of the period. Practically the only criticism of his pulpit manner was his peculiar use and overuse of gestures, gestures that had little meaning or relevance to the matter he was presenting. Favorite pulpit themes of his were the necessity for the new birth, non-conformity (Romans 12:2), the reward of the righteous, and the happiness of "meeting where parting shall be no more." He was a constant Bible student. A contemporary recalls that "Elias Riehl's old yellow buggy always had a Bible or a Testament lying on the seat."

A full-length portrait of some of the other ministers is no longer possible. Not even the names of early ministers are remembered by surviving members of the congregation. Anyone acquainted with Amish practice in ordinations would question whether Bishop Solomon Yoder and Deacon Christian Stoltzfus carried the whole responsibility of shepherding the flock from the founding of the colony in 1836 or 1837. Christian Stoltzfus was not ordained deacon until 1839. It is possible that the date of his ordination marks the date of organization of the congregation.

The ministers from 1860 to 1870 were Bishop Elias Riehl, Preacher Christian King, Deacon Christian Stoltzfus and Bishop-deacon Michael Swartz. In 1869 Preacher Andrew Miller moved to Union county from Baltimore county, Maryland. Deacon Swartz is thought by some to have been a regularly ordained preacher, but he was merely a bishop-deacon (Voelliger-Armendiener) who sometimes preached. Preacher Christian (Christel) King and his wife were extremely conservative, even more like the present Old Order Amish in their belief and practice than many of their conservative contemporaries. He vigorously opposed any innovations. His on-

ly inquiry as to the wisdom or expediency of any policy was: Does it agree with the practice of the fathers? Lack of sympathy with the Amish Mennonite Conference, rather than lack of means seem to have kept him away from its sessions. He was a highly successful, well-to-do farmer, one of the older type of Amish whose "word was as good as his bond." In the performance of his ministerial duties he adhered strictly to the older forms. His veneration for the German prayer book was almost as great as his reverence for the Holy Scriptures. Some of his contemporaries do not recall that he ever offered any public prayer except those that he read from this prayer book. During the later years of the history of the congregation he and his family moved to his former home in Lancaster county where he allied himself with the extreme Low Order Amish near Millwood. There he continued active service in the ministry, was finally raised to the office of bishop, and served faithfully in that capacity to a ripe old age.

Deacon Christian Stoltzfus had, with all his geniality, hospitality, neighborliness, and practical piety, much of the dislike for newness and change, much of the conservative spirit that has come to be associated with the name Stoltzfus. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' great-grandson, C. Z. Mast, the Mennonite historian and genealogist, states that he knows of no other group that numbers a larger percentage of faithful adherents to the teachings and principles of the Mennonite church than the Stoltzfus family. It is significant, however, that many who have known the deacon's family have never heard any of his children or neighbors speak of him except to praise his sound judgment and his generous, kindly spirit.

Considering the period during which Christian Stoltzfus grew to maturity and comparing his educational and cultural attainments with those of his contemporaries, one is struck by the beauty of his penmanship and his mastery of the art of expression. His style, though colored by his German background, compares favorably with that of his contemporaries both Mennonite and Amish. Extracts from his letters written when he was nearly eighty years old reveal his sense of humor and his genial, kindly spirit. In January, 1880, he wrote to his recently-married daughter, spending her honeymoon in Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, visiting friends: "My love and best Respects to you Dear Beloved ———— and to your beloved Husband ————. Yours of yesterday was received this afternoon Stating that youns were all well we can say the same at present, for which we thank our Heavenly father Daily in weaknes . . . We have the bird cage withe the bird in our house and I Want you to bring a companyon for it when you come I think it

would feal better Sadisfight with a hea companyon as well as you your Self . . . [6] Last Friday we Butchered Sold 2 hogs and kept 2. don't Stay too long or we will Eat all the new Sasages before you come. Simeon [the deacon's son] and Elias Riehl [probably the bishop] compermised and became good friends again Meeting will be at Sims next Sunday [January 11, 1880]. Now I Shall close my Scripling with my Best wishes to you and your beloved Husband also our Love and best wishes to ———— and her beloved husband So much from your father Christian Stoltzfus."

A week later he writes this same daughter another letter in which among other things he writes: "You Staded you were not Done visiting yet. Mame [pronounced mommy] Saith you might Stay till you get through visiting . . . Please your Self about that the Boys can get Some one to doe there feeding when the goe to Miffling Co, there is not much work here on the farm till Some time in March and about the bird, Mame Saith Sam Baus has a hea and a shea one and each one has its own cage the will not doe together in one cage if that is the case I Doe not want to have Enything to Doe with them. I thought it was too Lonesome for one alone and 2 would be compeney to Each other. But if the cant live Peacable in one cage I doe not want them . . .
I was as Simeon and Isaacs [two of his sons living on farms adjoining his] gest now came home . . . Isaacs are Butchering to Day. I went over to see whether the will take the Meeting next time, the agreet to take it
this morning the theramomator stood 2. degrees below 0 . . . from last Sunday 4 Weaks Meeting will be with us mind that . . . to Day the boys are halling corn in the barn floor Ready to Shell I have sold it at 50 cts per bu the must Doe that before the can goe to Miffling co if we get about 3 or 4 Nights as cold as last night there will be Ice to fill the Icehouse that will be another Little gop for the boys . . ."

Every letter that he writes during these weeks makes several references to the return home of his newly-wed daughters and their husbands. Fortunately one of these half-lonely paragraphs is written as a German postscript at the end of one of his letters. It is interesting as a specimen of the Union county German of this period. He wrote a beautiful German script, but this paragraph is written in equally beautiful English script.

[6] The "bird" here referred to is the daughter's canary which does not seem pleased at having moved from the house on the farm where the daughters had been living with their younger brothers, down to the grandfather house where the aged deacon and his wife resided after retiring from the active operation of the farm.

"Der Prediger Salomon Sagt Es hat alles Seine Zeit Also hat Des besuchen auch Seine Zeit. Es ist eine zeit um Zu besuchen und auch eine Zeit um wieder heim zu gehen Vergesset Sel nicht Wan der [son-in-law] nichts zu Schaffen hat dan mag er Eben so wohl mit komen aber do ist auch nicht viel zu thun vor die zeit Noch Ein grusz der Liebe und Des Friedens von mir und Der Mame am [son-in-law] Seine Eltern Date und Mame Sie Sollen uns auch Schreiben und bei gelegenheit Besuchen C S "

In May of the next year his son-in-law and daughter again were visiting in Lancaster county.

"Dear beloved Soninlaw and Daughter," he writes, ". . . in the first place you Stade aboud being in Church & you wish that we could all be as well Sadisfied with each other as the Seemed to be there is no doubt in my mind at all if we pray to god for help and all Strive to do what is right & love god & our brethren and Systers that we may get along here all right again there is nothing impossble if we will doe our duty our heavenly Father will doe his to his children . . .

"We had visiters here after Meating Sonday afternoon John Caufmans and Henry Lantz from Peaque [Pequea, Lancaster county] and Jacobs [his son's family]

"yesterday we went with them to Dave Smuckers and John Glicks and Andrew Millers for Super Today Mame is washing I was diging gardon [he was nearly seventy-eight years old] Ely [now Bishop Eli B. Stoltzfus, Portage county, Ohio] whent for Posts Christley [the deacon's grandson] was clearing off the corn-stocks of the tobacco patch and burnt them . . . My tobacco plants will soon be big enough to set out Some of them yours ditto . . . Now I Shall close with these words remember us in your prayers we shall try with the help of god to doe the same for you your wellwishing parents C and L Stoltzfus."

During the closing years of his life Deacon Christian Stoltzfus spent many hours writing a German manusscript that has been handed down to his descendants.

The aged deacon's pathetic reference in the last letter to the state of the church refers to the tragedy of the closing years of the congregation when a committee of Mifflin county bishops, called in to settle certain difficulties, ended their work by silencing Bishop Elias Riehl and excommunicating the bishop's brother, Joel and the latter's wife, Betsy (Byler) Riehl, the founder of the Union county Amish Mennonite Sunday school. Like its sister congregations in Lancaster and Mifflin county, the Union county congregation had had its difficulties through the years but had always

been able to maintain sufficient peace and unity so that the repeated divisions that sundered the Mifflin county congregations never materialized in Union county. On one occasion, it is true, serious difficulty threatened. During the sixties a certain Christian Byler and his wife and Isaac Walker (brother-in-law of Bishop Riehl and Deacon Stoltzfus) and his wife (possibly a few others also) separated from the main body and organized an informal prayer meeting for a time. Since neither of these two families had any children, their withdrawal affected the prosperity of the congregation very little. Isaac Walker and his wife eventually returned to Lancaster county.

Voelliger Diener Elias Riehl and Armendiener Christian Stoltzfus seem always to have been on the friendliest terms in spite of the fact that Riehl was the superior in office and was a score of years younger than Stoltzfus. Various occasions for offense arose, but their friendship seems to have weathered every storm for more than forty years. Some of the deacon's sons by his first marriage frequently came under the censure of the church,[7] and it was Riehl's duty as Voelliger Diener to discipline them. He did so with considerable severity without losing the deacon's friendship or support. Deacon Stoltzfus made it a rule never to shield his sons when they had violated the rules of the church.

According to a contemporary, "some of the deacon's sons by his first wife were always in hot water." One of these sons, Simeon, had a vineyard. When his house burned in the early eighties, he lost sixty barrels of wine (some say two hundred and sixty barrels) stored in his cellar. Some of this wine was fifteen years old. As indicated above, Elias Riehl probably had enlisted the aid of the 1873 Amish conference in dealing with the problem. The wine cellar exercised an unwholesome influence in the community and was the cause of a great deal of trouble for Voelliger-Diener Riehl as well as for the aged Armendiener Stoltzfus. When Simeon's house burned, his father, the deacon, hurried across the fields to render whatever aid his fourscore years might lend. On meeting a neighbor returning from the fire and learning that the entire family was safe he retraced his steps to his residence without so much as an inquiry about the loss of the wine.

In spite of the many causes for disagreement and the trying situations that arose during the sixties and seventies, the friendship and coöperation of Riehl and Stoltzfus continued. When the latter's

---

[7] Jacob and Jonathan, however, were exemplary young men.

second wife bore him her first son, Stoltzfus named him Elias for his friend, Voelliger Diener Elias Riehl.

Preacher Christian King, however, and Voelliger Armendiener Swartz failed to appreciate either the pulpit eloquence or the progressive policies of their bishop. There was constant friction. King was extremely conservative in matters of form and discipline. Schwartz constantly exclaimed against "the shocking pride of the young people." The congregation was kept in such turmoil that communion services could be held only twice between 1873 and 1884. Eventually, the bitterness that would break out at the semi-annual service, preparatory to communion, became perennial and peace was at an end.

The unsatisfactory state of affairs is further attested by the failure of some of the younger people to unite with the Union county congregation. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' daughters had been baptized and received into the church at the age of fifteen and seventeen respectively, but his son, Eli, did not become a member of the Amish Mennonite church until he was past twenty. Even then he did not unite with the Union county congregation. After the marriage of his sisters in December, 1879, and his brother-in-law's employment on the Stoltzfus homestead, Eli was employed as a hired man in Lancaster county for eleven dollars a month. During that summer he joined the instruction class and was baptized and received into fellowship in the Amish Mennonite church by Bishop John P. Mast in the home of Jacob Umble about one mile north of the Gap in Lancaster county.

An incident said to have been characteristic of Bishop-Deacon Michael Swartz occurred when Eli Stoltzfus and others united with the church. Swartz, a widower, seems to have been making his home in Lancaster county at the time and was one of the examining ministers when the class was inducted into the church. During the course of his remarks he told them that he was interested in their spiritual welfare and asked if they would consent to do anything that he might suggest or require if he later pointed out any of their shortcomings. Disarmed by his apparent friendliness, they quite innocently replied that they would. At the next meeting of the congregation, Swartz came to the boys, asked them if they recalled their promise, and if they still were willing to keep their word. On their replying in the affirmative he asked them to remove their neckties. They did so, but with considerable reluctance.

The breach between Elias Riehl and Christian Stoltzfus finally came as the indirect result of an incident, so trivial that it is dif-

ficult, in looking back, to understand how it would have been so devastating in its effects. A certain young woman reported that she had received an anonymous letter. There was nothing in the letter that might not have passed quietly if peace and good will had prevailed in the congregation. Enemies of the bishop and his family, however, were ready to fix the blame on the bishop's son who had written a letter to another young woman in the congregation. The anonymous letter at once became the subject of a spirited investigation. The congregation, certain that Riehl's son had written the letter, determined to fix the blame on him. Specimens of the writing of a dozen or more of the young people of the congregation were submitted for the inspection of a handwriting expert. This expert reported that the anonymous letter had not been penned by any of those whose writing he had examined. In spite of his findings a majority of the congregation still believed the bishop's son guilty and demanded that the bishop discipline him. The bishop, naturally and rightly, refused to do so. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus, opposed by his family and a majority of the congregation, stood with Bishop Elias Riehl throughout this controversy.

In consequence of the bitterness engendered by the anonymous letter the congregation divided into rival camps and became extremely critical of each other. For many years at the close of nearly every church service the request came from the ministers: "Die Brueder und die Schwestern sollen noch sitzen bleiben" (The brethren and sisters are requested to remain seated). Or the order came: "Alle die wo net Brueder und Schwestern sind solle jetzt apdrede" (All those who are not members are requested to retire). Even the youngest child came to understand that this meant that all but members were excused. Members were to remain for an executive session of the congregation while ministry and laymen wrangled about this or that disciplinary measure. Charges and counter charges were discussed with a bluntness, directness and candor that would disrupt any but the most cohesive group. The children and non-members, meanwhile, received a lunch of small half-moon dried-apple pies and went out into the barn or the wood-lot to play games until the difficulty could be settled or action deferred, and the regular noon day lunch of bread and butter, pickles, beets, and half-moon dried-apple pies could be served.

The mystery of the anonymous letter remained unsolved for more than a quarter of a century. Twenty years ago a voluntary confession absolved the bishop's son from all blame. The woman in question called the wrongfully accused young man to her one

day and surprised him with the confession that she had written the letters to herself, to impress her friends with her popularity. At his request she repeated the confession in the presence of a witness. Naturally the long-suspected victim of the young woman's thoughtlessness was overjoyed at having the mystery explained and the blame removed, but he wept as he said, "It is too late to tell Uncle Samuel! He died believing that I wrote that letter!" The matter was the subject of long and bitter controversy at the time and did as much as any one thing to disrupt the congregation. The bishop's son does appear to have written some letters, but not to the young woman in question.

About 1880 another serious difficulty arose. Deacon Stoltzfus' sons John, Simeon, and Jacob accepted the agency for the Halliday windmill. The first mill is said to have been erected by Samuel Kennel on the roof of John Stoltzfus' barn southeast of Vicksburg. Others were soon in operation and the agency promised good returns. On ascertaining that the Stoltzfus brothers held their agency under a verbal contract one of Bishop Riehl's sons took the train to the factory and secured a written contract giving him the sole right to sell and erect the Halliday windmill. Legally he was within his rights, no doubt. The Riehl brothers and not the Stoltzfus brothers were now the duly authorized representatives for the Halliday windmill. They canvassed the country driving a team of horses with cloth covers bearing in large letters the announcement "Riehl Brothers, Sole Representatives, The Halliday Windmill." The Stoltzfus brothers then became agents for the Hall windmill.

Members of the congregation demanded that the bishop discipline his sons for the way in which they secured the contract. He took no action in the matter. Practically the entire congregation including Bishop Riehl's brothers-in-law took sides with the Stoltzfus brothers and demanded church action. Finally one Sunday after meeting when Deacon Stoltzfus announced that services would be held at the home of Jacob Stoltzfus (eldest surviving son of the deacon and executor of his last will and testament) in two weeks, Jacob emphatically asserted in the hearing of everyone present, "Der 'Lias Riehl bredigt net in meim Haus." Bishop Riehl absented himself from services after that. Finally even Deacon Stoltzfus yielded to the demands of the congregation and took the voice of the church relative to calling in an investigating committee. The result, as everyone foresaw, was an overwhelming vote in favor of calling ministers from Mifflin county. Tradition reports that Voel-

liger Armendiener Samuel Yoder and Preacher David Zook were chosen to settle the difficulty. Feeling had become so strong that many in the congregation demanded not only the silencing of the bishop, but his excommunication as well.

Deacon Stoltzfus' son, Eli, remembers driving to Misers Station, located on the railroad running from McVeytown in Mifflin county to Sunbury on the Susquehanna river, to meet the members of the investigating committee from Mifflin county. He brought them to his father's home and recalls part of the conversation that took place that evening. During the next few days members of the committee did considerable visiting. Bishop Riehl and his handful of supporters remained inflexible. The opposition clamored for immediate and drastic action.

Finally the committee called a member's meeting, which, however, Bishop Riehl and his friends refused to attend. After a perfunctory trial the congregation, with the exception of some of the bishop's sisters, voted to silence Bishop Elias Riehl and to excommunicate the bishop's brother, Joel, and the latter's wife. Technically the action against Bishop Riehl does not seem to have carried with it loss of membership, but merely the surrender of his rights and privileges as a bishop and minister. Actually, however, Bishop Riehl was no longer considered a member.

Bishop Riehl and his group never considered the action of the committee valid. On the regular meeting Sunday after his excommunication, he and his family met at the home of his brother Joel with one other family and held a complete church service. Joel Riehl and the third man of the company offered testimony after the sermon. They continued holding services regularly for some time. Bishop Riehl and some of his friends eventually united with the Mennonite congregation at Richfield, in Juniata county.

Most Amish and Amish Mennonite ministers considered the action of the Mifflin county committee binding and refused to fellowship Bishop Riehl. Some years after the action of the Mifflin county committee two young people of Lancaster county, Isaac K. Umble and Christina Lantz asked Bishop Riehl to officiate at their wedding. Some of the Union county Amish Mennonite relatives and friends of the young people thought "that it could not be that one who was not really a bishop, not even a minister, should be asked to perform the sacred rites of the church." Most Mennonites, on the other hand, continued to work with Bishop Riehl and allowed him to preach in their services. On one occasion while Preacher David Hostetler from Wayne county, Ohio, was holding services at a certain place, he observed the excommunicated bishop

enter the meetinghouse and take a seat in the back row. He walked to the rear of the room, took the bishop by the arm, led him to the pulpit, and insisted that he take part in the service.

As time went on his case became an exceptional one. Bishop Riehl was never formally reinstated, but before his death his humility and inoffensive conduct regained for him the confidence and respect of the Mifflin county ministers. Whenever he visited there, he was recognized, not only as a brother in full fellowship, but also as a minister in good standing. He was usually asked to preach the morning sermon.

The pastor of the Salem Evangelical church in the heart of the Union county Amish settlement never considered the silencing of Bishop Riehl as more than an unwarranted transgression of authority by a committee of foreigners. Soon after he was silenced, Riehl attended a funeral at the Salem church. When the pastor observed him in the audience, he insisted that the deposed bishop come to the platform and preach the funeral sermon. One who was present remembers this sermon as one of the most eloquent and powerful that he ever heard Riehl deliver.

After the expulsion of the Riehl families the congregation went on as before. Dissatisfaction in the congregation had become so general, possibly it would be better to say so perennial, that even with the Riehl families out there was little real unity. Eventually Preacher Christian King and his family moved to Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, and, as was to be expected, united with the extreme Low Order Amish near Millwood. His wife, Mary (Stoltzfus) King, died in Lancaster county, October 17, 1907. Between 1880 and 1885, Deacon Christian Stoltzfus and four of his sons by his first marriage died: John, June 6, 1880; Samuel (unmarried) June 21, 1883; Deacon Christian, Nov. 4, 1883; Simeon, April 16, 1884; and Jacob, March 21, 1885. Meanwhile, the deacon's son, Isaac, brother-in-law of Bishop Jacob C. Kanagy, of Cass county, Missouri, had moved (apparently in 1883) to Lyon county, Kansas, near Hartford, had purchased a farm, and had become interested in the real estate business. The glowing reports sent back East induced a number of his relatives and friends in Union county, Pennsylvania, and in Champaign and Logan counties, Ohio, to purchase land near Hartford.

In 1884 two families followed Isaac Stoltzfus to Lyon county: Mr. and Mrs. Jonathan Stoltzfus and family;[8] and Mrs. Mattie

[8] He was the father of Preacher Ammon Stoltzfus, Milford, Nebraska, and the grandfather of Preacher Nicholas Stoltzfus of Manson, Iowa.

(Hartzler) Stoltzfus, widow of Simeon Stoltzfus, and her family.[9]

In 1885 five more of the deacon's children and their families with the two Miller brothers, John O. and Preacher Andrew, chartered an emigrant car and moved to the vicinity of Hartford. Each of the deacon's children had inherited three thousand dollars. Those who moved West invested their portion in Kansas land or in improvements thereon. The members of the emigrant party were; the deacon's widow, Mrs. Lydia (Beiler) Stoltzfus; Nancy B. Stoltzfus (Mrs. Frank Umble), with her husband and two boys; Lizzie B. Stoltzfus (wife of Preacher David Stoltzfus, ordained in Union county in 1883) with her husband and two girls; Eli B. Stoltzfus (at present, 1933, a Mennonite bishop in Portage county, Ohio) with his bride, Martha Ellen Yoder, daughter of Bishop Jonas C. Yoder, Bellefontaine, Ohio;[10] and Benjamin B. Stoltzfus (unmarried);[11] Mr. and Mrs. John O. Miller and family; Preacher and Mrs. Andrew Miller and family. The Miller brothers, as stated above, had married two sisters of Elias Riehl. At least one of the bishop's unmarried sisters, Rebecca, joined her sisters in Kansas a few years later and died there. Samuel Kennel never moved to Kansas, but lived from 1869 until his death in Union County about twenty years ago. He was buried in the Beiler cemetery. A few years ago Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Kennel and Magdalena (Neuhauser) Kennel, mother of Samuel were reinterred in the Lewisburg cemetery by their surviving children.

The removal of Preacher Christian King to Lancaster county and of Preachers Andrew Miller and David Stoltzfus to Hartford, Kansas, deprived the remaining Amish Mennonite families in Union county of a minister. David Smucker moved to Vicksburg and was a prosperous merchant there in 1890, but eventually removed to Belleville, Pennsylvania. Some of the Glick families, also, remained in Union county for a number of years, but are now widely scattered in the Mennonite and Amish Mennonite communities of

---

[9] The widow Mattie Stoltzfus married Deacon Joseph Stuckey at Hartford a few years later.

[10] Eli Stoltzfus had gone to Kansas during the previous year, had purchased a farm on the virgin prairie, and erected a house ready to receive his bride. He and his bride boarded the emigrant train when it reached Urbana, Ohio. At a service held at the South Union church near West Liberty, on February 19, 1885, the bride's father pronounced Eli B. Stoltzfus and Ella Yoder man and wife. After the ceremony S. E. Allgyer and other friends with bob-sleds and sleighs took the wedding party to Urbana where the bride and groom joined the emigrants. Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Warye also joined the group at this time.

[11] Benjamin was married April 9, 1885, near Hartford, to Emma Rich, daughter of a pioneer Mennonite family who had moved to Kansas from Nebraska or Iowa prior to 1880.

the East and South. L. S. Glick, Tampa, Florida, is one of the descendants of the Union county pioneers. The sons and daughters of Jacob Stoltzfus with their families moved to Lancaster county during the late eighties. There most of their descendants remain, loyal adherents of the Amish or Amish Mennonite faith.

Nearly all of the Lyon county, Kansas, group returned to West Liberty, Ohio, about 1890. John O. Miller and his family moved to Fentress, Virginia, where some of his descendants still make their home. Elias R. Miller is his son. Dr. Silas Hertzler, of Goshen College, is his grandson. Preacher Andrew Miller removed to Missouri. His daughter, Mrs. Becky (Miller) King, widow of Ezra, son of Bishop John P. King, resides in West Liberty, Ohio, as does also Mrs. Lizzie Stoltzfus, widow of Preacher David Stoltzfus, and three of her daughters. Instead of returning East, Jonathan Stoltzfus and his family moved to Nebraska soon after the others left. His widow died there somewhat more than a year ago at a ripe old age. The orphaned family of Simeon Stoltzfus settled in the vicinity of Herrington, Kansas. Most of them are members of the Christian church.

Bishop Elias Riehl and his brother, Joel, spent the remainder of their lives in Union county. Bishop Riehl died March 11, 1901, and was buried on March 13, in the Beiler cemetery. Here repose also the mortal remains of Joel Riehl and his second wife, Betsy (Beiler) Riehl. Katie Riehl, daughter of Joel Riehl, married Ezra B. Kauffman and moved to Champaign county, Ohio, where she died in 1897. Her sons, Harry J. and Roy Kauffman, reside near West Liberty, Ohio. Ezra J. Riehl, son of Joel, moved near West Liberty, Ohio, in 1900 and died there, April 1, 1930. His widow, son and two married daughters live at West Liberty. Ezra Riehl's older sister, Elizabeth, was the wife of the late Jonas Hooley, Kennard, Ohio. Her present address is Delaware, Ohio, where she resides with her son, Clyde (former member of the Ohio state legislature) in his beautiful country home on the banks of the Olentangy River.

In spite of much unhappiness, discord, and dissatisfaction in the Union county congregation the picture is not without its bright spots. References to the visiting, suppers, sports, and singings in the letters quoted above and in the earlier article indicate a happy social life. Tradition insists that, in the main, it was wholesome. Even Preacher Christel King, stern and strict as he was, approved and practised the old Amish custom of Sunday visiting, although he would probably have objected to calling such occasions social gatherings. Church services being held only on alternate Sundays

allowed an intervening Sunday for visiting. One of Christel King's objections to the Sunday school was that the holding of a service every Sunday would crowd out the Sunday visiting.

As already stated, the homes were too widely scattered to permit the erection of a centrally located meetinghouse even if it had been considered desirable or necessary to build one. Deacon Christian Stoltzfus several times offered to donate a plot beside the Stoltzfus burying ground for a building site. He felt that the task of preparing for the meeting in the homes placed too heavy a burden on the women of the congregation. Nearly a week of scrubbing, cleaning, and baking before the Sunday services and much hard work in cleaning afterward could be avoided, he insisted, by the erection of a suitable building. One member, a certain Glick, objected that to discontinue services in the homes would take away the last vestige of neighborliness and fellowship in the congregation.

Not only was there much visiting among those north of Buffalo Creek on the one hand, and among those south of the Lewisburg-Mifflinburg road on the other, but in spite of the quarrels among their elders and considerable jealousy between the two groups of young people, there were many happy social gatherings. The cheerful home of Joel Riehl was the scene of frequent suppers and singings. The home of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus was also a popular meeting place for the young people. Then, too, there was much visiting with relatives in Maryland and in Lancaster, Mifflin, and Juniata counties. One of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus' letters refers to visitors from "Marilan, Miffling, and Peque."

In spite of the strong opposition of Preacher Christel King and the lukewarmness of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus toward Sunday school, the settlement organized a school at a surprisingly early date. To the Riehls and Millers must go the credit for the organization of this first Sunday school. Even before the formal organization of Sunday school in Union county, Joel Riehl's second wife, Elizabeth (Beiler) Riehl, had gathered some of the children of the neighborhood and her own children into her home on Sunday afternoons and had taught them the Sunday school lesson in German. She seems to have been a woman of marked intelligence and of a progressive spirit. The first strawberries ever raised in the Buffalo Valley were grown in her garden and served by her at a social given to the young people of the community.

Elias R. Miller recalls attending the German Sunday school at the Salem Evangelical church as a very small boy before Betsy Riehl's class was organized. He still has the German reader and hymn book that he used at Salem. Amish children were not sup-

posed to attend Sunday school, but his mother was sufficiently progressive to allow him to go regularly. Elias R. Miller (still living; address: Fentress, Virginia) was one of the leading spirits in the later years. Like his uncle Elias Riehl, Elias Miller was a school teacher, an active, progressive young man. He taught school for several terms near West Liberty, Ohio, and was secretary of the German Sunday school at the Oak Grove church at that place for several years.

The first formal organization of the Sunday school in Union county was on May 5, 1872. J. E. Riehl, was elected superintendent and Joseph Zook, assistant. This Joseph Zook was married to Sarah Kurtz, daughter of Stephen and Hannah (Riehl) Kurtz. The facts of organization are preserved in an item sent to the *Herald of Truth* by E. R. Miller. His comment on the difficulties encountered and the state of the community at the time presents a picture of many Amish Mennonite communities during the seventies. He writes:

"Though laboring under some difficulties at first we have, by the grace of God, and an earnest effort so far succeeded that all but a few are now co-laborers in the good work.

"It is much better to spend the Sabbath in reading and explaining the Scriptures, than to spend it in visiting each other, and conversing about wordly affairs, jesting, and idling away this Holy Day. . . .

"Children are frequently allowed to visit each other and they generally idle away their time in playing and rambling in the woods; now if they are brought into the house of God, and the truths of the Scriptures explained to them, these things will be obviated. It is the duty of parents to take their children . . . but the Sabbath school is not the only place where the Scriptures should be taught." (The expression "house of God," is either a euphemism or a figure of speech. The settlement held the church services in private homes and Sunday school in the Fairmount schoolhouse on the bank of Turtle Creek.)

The plan, in the beginning, seems to have been to have Sunday school on one Sunday on the "Hill," as the Stoltzfus schoolhouse west of Kelly Point was called, and to have the next meeting at the Fairmount schoolhouse southeast of Vicksburg. But the school was held only one Sunday on the Hill. On that occasion some of Preacher Christel King's young people were present. When they reached home they reported that, owing to the unswept condition of the floor, some of the young men present had placed prayer books on the floor and knelt on them during prayer in order to

avoid soiling their trousers. That settled it for Christel King! This was proof positive that the unholy, worldly institution called the Sunday school permitted sacrilege and tolerated irreverence for divine things. His children attended no more. Possibly out of deference to his son-in-law's opinion, Deacon Christian Stoltzfus did not actively support the Sunday school, but he permitted his children to attend and seems actually to have encouraged their attendance. His wife certainly did so.

That Bishop Elias Riehl's association with his fellow ministers in the Amish Mennonite conference had much to do with his progressive attitude goes without saying. He and some of his brothers-in-law were early subscribers to the *Herald of Truth.* This was the exception and not the rule among Amish families in the sixties and seventies. In 1869 the bishop's nephew, E. R. Miller, then probably a boy of nine, sent in answers to certain Bible questions that appeared in the "Children's Column" of the *Herald of Truth* (issue of July, 1869). Some of these families were subscribers also of the *Words of Cheer.* E. R. Miller's sister, Katie (now Mrs. Katie Hoch, Hartford, Kansas) heads the list (*Words of Cheer,* June, 1881) of those who have committed scripture verses to memory. She reports five hundred. In the same issue David W. Kennel, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania (now of Goshen, Indiana), cousin of Elias and Katie Miller, wins third prize for solving Simon P. Yoder's "Bible Enigma." Here again in an unexpected quarter, in a very conservative Amish Mennonite community, the Mennonite Publishing Company is seen exercising a vital influence. David W. Kennel received a year's subscription to the *Words of Cheer* as a present from his father. And this at a time when most families had no literature of any kind in the home, except the Bible, the *Ausbund,* the prayer book, and the *Martyr's Mirror.* The only periodical usually found was the *Volksfreund.*

Late in the eighties the influence seems to be going in the opposite direction, that is, the Amish community is seeking to influence the Publishing Company. In spite of the disrupted condition of the settlement E. R. Miller is connected with a Sunday school there, which seems to be using the International lessons. He is urging the Mennonite Publishing Company to print these lessons with comments by a Mennonite editor for the use of Mennonite Sunday schools. His request precedes by several months the general discussion of this problem in the columns of the *Herald of Truth,* and the resultant action that gave *Mennonite Monthly Lesson Helps* to Mennonite Sunday schools in 1890, and the *Mennonite Quarterly* a little later.

The Union county Amish Mennonite settlement is now nothing more than a memory. Few landmarks remain. Glick's schoolhouse and the Hill school are still standing. The Hill schoolhouse, a mile west of the Deacon Stoltzfus' residence on Buffalo Creek, has undergone practically no change since the deacon's children attended school there seventy years ago when his daughter, Nancy, "beat" the entire school, big boys and all, in reading, spelling and ciphering. The store building where the deacon purchased the few supplies that were not homemade is still in use as a general store. The Rotharmel house and shoe cobbler shop, mentioned in his daughters' diary as the place where she received letters from her friends in Lancaster and Mifflin counties, is also standing, but in need of repair. The cemetery on the Deacon Stoltzfus homestead where he and several of his children lie buried is well-kept and carefully fenced with a thick concrete wall. His first wife lies buried in the Lantz cemetery on the Lewisburg-Mifflinburg pike, and his second wife in the Hooley cemetery near Kennard, Ohio. Lydia (Beiler) Stoltzfus and her son-in-law, Preacher David Stoltzfus, both died of pneumonia about 1895 at West Liberty, Ohio, within a few hours of each other. A double funeral service was held at the Oak Grove church and both were interred in the Hooley cemetery. Nancy B. (Stoltzfus) (Mrs. Frank) Umble and her husband are buried in the same cemetery. Here Preacher Benjamin B. Stoltzfus, also, at his special request, was buried less than a year ago. Two of the children of Deacon Christian and Lydia (Beiler) Stoltzfus survive: Bishop Eli B. Stoltzfus, Portage county, Ohio, and the widow of Preacher David Stoltzfus, Mrs. Lizzie Stoltzfus, West Liberty, Ohio.

Descendants of the hardy Buffalo Valley Amish pioneers are widely scattered from Virginia to California. A surprisingly large number of them are faithful members of some branch of the Amish or Mennonite churches. Some others are zealous Christians in other communions. Two of the Mennonite descendants of Union county pioneers are teaching in Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, one a grand-nephew of Bishop Elias Riehl, the other a grandson of Deacon Christian Stoltzfus. Here, at least, the old family differences are forgotten.

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

Review and Discussion

Edward Yoder

1. *The Conscientious Objector,* by Walter Guest Kellogg. Introduction by Newton D. Baker. Boni and Liveright. New York. (1919). Pp. xviii+141.

2. *The Conscientious Objector in America,* by Norman Thomas. Introduction by Robert M. LaFollette. B. W. Huebsch, Inc., New York. (1925). Pp. xix+299.

3. *Conscientious Objectors in the Civil War,* by Edward Needles Wright. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press. (1931). Pp. vii+274.

The term "conscientious objector," which is used to designate an individual who professes scruples of conscience against taking up arms when drafted for military service, seems to have come into general use only in the time of the late World War. The "objector" himself was in no sense a unique product of military conscription during this war, but he has figured regularly in the past when governments resorted to conscription in raising troops for carrying on their wars. As far back in history as the earliest Christian centuries there is record of men who refused to serve in the army for reasons of conscience.

Conscientious objectors include men who hold many and varied views on religious, moral and political matters. Their number is drawn from segments of society which are widely separated in times of peace, perhaps being scarcely aware of each other's existence. Many of them are members of religious sects whose creed or doctrinal position forbids them as a matter of principle to take any part in war, this tenet being based upon the specific teaching of Christ that his followers shall love their enemies and not resist aggression with force. These do not as a rule deny the authority of the government as such to conscript their services. The chief reason they allege for refusing to obey the state when drafted for military service is their inability to take part in the work of destroying human life. Some object only to the actual bearing of arms. Others cannot consent to render any kind of service which directly or indirectly contributes to the destructive business of war. Nor is it only sentiment and humanitarian feeling that holds such men back from inflicting death upon their fellows, but a profound religious conviction that it is a sin against God for them to take any part in that form of murder which men call war. Not all who object to war service on religious grounds are members of the recognized non-resistant sects. A scattered few are from denominations that have held no historic position against war. Some

are even found among them who do not profess adherence to any organized religious body.

Another and a smaller group of conscientious objectors may be designated as social idealists, men who on humanitarian, political, or idealistic grounds will not support either some particular war or all wars alike. Many of these resist conscription *per se*, on the ground that a State has no right to dispose of the individual's person as it will. Although holding different theories about the State and about the social order, about the rightness or the wrongness of using force for political ends, these men generally take the position of objectors to war because they regard modern warfare as an impractical means for settling international disputes. They believe that social progress is possible if those who have the vision of saner and more ethical methods in international dealings will assume an attitude of non-coöperation with the old order and even endure suffering in doing so, thereby challenging the thinking of intelligent people and arousing the conscience and conviction of their fellow-citizens against war and its folly.

Some of the objectors in the World War who did not feel free to perform even non-combatant service in the army, as such service was defined by President Woodrow Wilson in an executive order dated March 20, 1918, were willing to engage in agricultural or industrial work under the military arm of the government or to do reconstruction service under the Friends Unit abroad. A small number of both religious and idealist objectors, called absolutists, refused to do any kind of service under military orders because they regarded such obedience as an acknowledgment on their part of the authority of the military organization to coerce the individual conscience in any matter.

The classification of conscientious objectors into these general groups is necessarily very inadequate to give a true idea of the wide diversities of opinion that prevailed among them and of their views on war and the use of violence. If one were to seek a common denominator for all those who were numbered among the conscientious objectors, it is perhaps to be found in the words of Norman Thomas, who says: "They were marked by one common quality, a refusal in time of war to admit the right of the state to dispose of them as it would, irrespective of their convictions. . . . This assertion of the right of the individual to refuse obedience to the state even in the emergency of war or to lay down limits to which his conscience must be confined is the essence of conscientious objection." A Quaker writer, John W. Graham, finds the common basis of the conscientious objector fellowship in "the belief in the sacredness of human life as the vehicle of personality."

During the World War, especially the last two years of that struggle, the conscientious objectors attracted wide attention in both England and United States and their refusal to be swept by the tides of patriotic sentiment along with the masses of their fellows into the fighting ranks provoked widespread discussion. Scores of articles and scholarly essays appeared in leading journals of the time, not to mention the off-hand pronouncements made in newspaper columns. The

more serious and sober discussions were of every kind, both denunciatory and commendatory, exhausting in their repertoire about every type of consideration of the subject, philosophical, legal, social, moral, religious, pragmatical, idealistic. The extent of this interest and discussion and the zeal with which it was carried on at the time seems quite disproportionate to the real magnitude of the problem created by the conscientious objectors, if this were judged solely from its numerical significance.

The number of drafted men who are reported to have claimed objection to military service on grounds of conscience in England and United States is probably quite accurate. The number said to have so declared themselves in England was 16,000. Six thousand of these whose claims were disallowed held to them none the less and were sentenced to imprisonment. For the United States the records of the War Department show that approximately 65,000 claims for non-combatant service were originally registered, of which the boards recognized 57,000. Of this number 21,000 were inducted into the service during the period of the war. However, so far as statistics are available, it appears that only about four thousand men actually made claim in camp for exemption from combatant service or from all service. This number represents about one-seventh of one percent of the total number of men inducted into the army, truly an insignificant number which might ordinarily be ignored. The measure of attention given to this small group of drafted men was significant possibly of a heartfelt interest in the cause of peace and may be considered as an unconscious compliment paid to the few stalwarts who manifested enough courage to protest against a war which most people disliked. Also the state saw in the attitude of these men a direct challenge of its authority in a time of crisis. The ill-will frequently expressed toward objectors by soldiers and by civilians may itself represent a sort of defense reaction, to speak in the jargon of the psychologists, against a scruple of conscience unwillingly or willingly suppressed.

When the United States entered the conflict in 1917 and the Selective Service Act was enacted and the efficient engines of military propaganda had been put in motion the previous almost universal pacifist sentiment in the nation quickly died away or was silenced. Those who had sufficient conviction as to the wrongness of war to stand by their principles became the objects of particular scorn and occasionally of an animus like to that which American patriots were taught to feel toward the Germans. Erstwhile pacifists were now writing and publishing essays to prove that a decisive victory over Germany would really be a long step forward in the realization of the pacifist's ideal of a warless world. Other ex-pacifists were pleading with their obdurate brethren to join in the war and so help save an entity they called civilization. The militarists themselves exhorted those with tender conscience by confident appeals to biology and to history for proof that war belongs to the nature of things and that all progress has been achieved at the price of struggle and conflict. Clergymen labored hard over a few Biblical texts, violently wrenched from their contexts, to demonstrate that the conscientious objectors erred in assuming the historic representation of Jesus as a

gentle, non-resistant character to be correct. To their own satisfaction they were able to prove that on certain occasions Jesus used violence and approved its use. One writer reflected the ordinary uncritical attitude toward the objectors when he spoke of these "curious cases of perverted viewpoints." Dr. Lyman Abbott, an eminent preacher and author, arbitrarily interpreted Jesus' words "Resist not evil," to mean: "Resist not evil when it assails your personal interests, but you may resist it to the death, if need be, when it assails those whom it is your duty to protect."

Among the accusations leveled at the conscientious objector by unsympathetic writers at the time three appear to be rather serious. One was that the objector's position is unethical, that he is a parasite in society because he accepts and uses the civil and religious liberties which have been won through past wars and these he now refuses to help defend. A certain bishop of the South in writing a pugnacious diatribe on the point described such conduct picturesquely as "moral thievery." A second charge brought against the man who obeys his conscience in refusing to fight in war is that of egoism, an assumed moral superiority over his fellows which is a mark of smallness of character. And a third major accusation was that the position of the conscientious objector is undemocratic and unsocial. Writers who sought to emphasize this viewpoint usually laid great stress upon "the supremacy of the collective will and purpose" in a democracy and pled for coöperation with the majority decision (asking no questions for conscience' sake).

These hostile charges were ably answered and refuted in articles written by various writers, prominent among whom were such men as John Haynes Holmes, Norman Thomas, Bertrand Russell, James Bryce. Unfortunately their defenses of the conscientious objector did not always appear in the same journals which published the attacks. The principal lines of apology they offered for the position of the objectors were philosophical and idealistic. Sometimes the religious and Biblical apology was stated in passing, but rarely were the religious objectors adequately defended on the Biblical grounds upon which most of them based their objection. Many writers who attempted to deal with the viewpoint of the religious objector succeeded only in demonstrating that they had failed to understand his position.

The same lively interest in the problem of the conscientious objectors which provoked general discussion of the subject at the time has since then also brought forth a number of books which deal with the same subject. Three important volumes of this kind by American authors are listed at the head of this article.

The first of these was written soon after the close of the war by Major Walter Guest Kellogg, who was chairman of the Board of Inquiry appointed by the War Department in 1918. In pursuance of the duties of his position Major Kellogg says he personally examined over eight hundred objectors in twenty widely distributed camps and military posts. In his book he gives an account of the work of the Board of Inquiry and records his personal impressions of the conscientious objectors. It is a valuable record of facts and general in-

formation on the subject. On the whole the interpretation of the material appears superficial and casual rather than analytical. The writer tries to be fairminded and objective in his conclusions, but he does not always succeed so happily in his splendid purpose.

Of the religious objectors, the Quakers impressed the Major the best, showing as he thought, a commendable measure of culture and intelligence. The Mennonites, who including those from all their branches comprised at least fifty percent of the religious objectors, receive the most extended mention in this book by name. Besides his failure to appreciate the viewpoint of the religious objector to war and to military service, Major Kellogg seemed to have conceived a particular dislike for the Mennonite objector. Drawing his conclusions from a few extreme samples who especially irritated his feelings, he proceeds to characterize the social, mental, and economic conditions of the 75,000 or more Mennonites in the United States. Needless to say his characterization is very unfair. Among the conspicuous words used in his hasty generalization are "intellectual inferiority," "ignorance," "moron," "mental weakling," "bovine," "stupid and dull." It is a matter of regret that the author did not have at hand before he published his book the results of tests made regarding the intelligence of different groups of men in the army. Had he had these results at hand, his impressions of the Mennonites and of religious objectors could have been corrected in some measure. The results of one such test were published by Winthrop D. Lane in the *New Republic* of April 14, 1920, and another was reported by Mark May in the *American Journal of Psychology* of April, 1920. According to these tests a larger percentage of the religious objectors made scores which ranked above average than out of large groups of enlisted privates and drafted men in the army who were given the same test.

For the religious objector in general Major Kellogg felt only a mild contempt mingled with pity for his backwardness and what he is pleased to call his lack of a social sense. He was much humiliated by his discovery that there live within the borders of this land groups of people whom American democracy after some generations of residence has failed to reach with its benign educative and standardizing influence. It is true that many of the religious objectors came from farms, but not generally were they from the backwoods, as he inferred. They were perhaps not as socialminded, interested and informed about national and world affairs, as they should have been. It is unlikely, however, that these objectors were markedly inferior in these respects to other groups of men from the rural sections of the country who went into the training ranks when they were drafted and whom Major Kellogg and his Board had no occasion to examine. Seemingly the Major has no inkling of the nature and the strength of a genuine religious conviction or of a religious ideal that is seriously entertained. Besides the men who entered the ranks at their country's call from a sense of duty, there were undoubtedly large numbers who did so because of the social and psychological pressure that was produced by propaganda. Such of these as weakly conformed to the majority opinion of the moment may perhaps be called socialminded in some superficial sense, but it is not so evident

that they contribute more to society and to the moral stability of the world than those who live by religious principles and convictions.

The book by Norman Thomas is in many respects the complement of Major Kellogg's book and provides the necessary correction for some of its shortcomings. Mr. Thomas' book was published later, at a time when it was possible to view the conscientious objector situation in a better perspective. Its author is not a military official, but a former clergyman and a socialist of the idealistic school. He shows a sympathetic understanding of the position of the religious objectors and is eminently fair in the representation he gives of their case. The fuller share of attention is given to the political and idealist objectors and his interpretation of the conscientious objector situation as a whole is from the idealistic viewpoint. During the wartime, when the objectors were so prominently in the public notice, Mr. Thomas wrote constantly in their behalf, counting himself among their number. His principal thesis in defense of the objectors of all kinds was that society for the sake of its own welfare and progress cannot afford to suppress or coerce the conscience of its individual idealists and visionaries. These scattered individuals quite as much, if not more than the masses who take part in war have always been the cause of social and moral advance.

The first part of the book reviews the grounds of conscientious objection, the types of objectors brought forth by the selective draft, and the government's policy in dealing with the objectors. More than half of the book is devoted to a description of the objectors themselves, with special attention to those absolutists who refused to perform any kind of service under the military arm of the government, combatant, non-combatant, or alternative service in agriculture or industry. The policy of the War Department in dealing with the conscientious objector situation is traced in detail, showing up its weaknesses and its inadequacy. In forming a judgment on the policies that were used it is necessary to bear in mind that amid the complexity of the war machinery so suddenly set up in the United States in 1917 officials were unable to give full and deliberate consideration to a detail which involved only a few thousand men among several millions. The wonder is rather that with all the bungling and blind groping of that time there were not more and greater tragedies enacted among those who suffered for conscience' sake.

Very detailed is the description Mr. Thomas gives of the brutalities and the injustice suffered by the absolutist objectors in training camp, at the hands of courts-martial, and especially in military prisons and disciplinary barracks. The evidence for the facts he gives consists largely in the testimony of the individuals who themselves suffered. The author freely criticizes the injustice of the Government in permitting the brutal punishments in prison to continue for a long time after the war ended in the Armistice. Nearly five years had passed after the Armistice was signed when the last objectors were released from federal prisons.

This book is clearly printed and well bound in cloth and it has an index. Kellogg's book is not so well made and it has no index,

but it does have at the end nine appendices giving much valuable information, data, statistics, and official documents.

The third volume, by Edward Needles Wright, is distinguished from both those before noticed by the strictly objective treatment of the subject which it presents, a viewpoint which is naturally more easily attained in a piece of historical research, such as this is, than in a contemporary account. Instead of writing from personal observation and personal experience with its almost inevitable tincture of personal feeling, the writer of this volume has been able to present a picture of the conscientious objector in the American Civil War that is true and authoritative. Much of the material in the book is presented in the form of extended citations from official government documents and from the records kept by the sects from whom the objectors of that time came. The Society of Friends (Quakers) furnished most of the objectors at that time, as it appears, and many of their Meetings kept extensive records of their Society's official activities and also of the experiences of their individual members in the military draft. It is upon these various records that the writer has drawn for the bulk of his book.

The expressed aims of the author are two. The first is to describe and define the respective attitudes that were taken by the governments, North and South, towards the conscientious objectors and show what methods were used in dealing with them. The second purpose is to describe the efforts that were put forth by the different non-resistant sects to make clear to the governments their position on war service and what was done by these groups officially to maintain their peace testimony during the time of the war. The members of the peace sects who lived in the Confederate States suffered more hardships than those in the North because they were generally opposed to slavery, which was the issue of the war, and furthermore the South had to draw more heavily on its man-power than the North.

The closing chapter of Mr. Needles' book is valuable as a brief comparative study of the conscientious objector situation in the Civil War and the more recent World War. Conditions are shown to have been essentially different in a number of particulars. In the earlier period objectors could free themselves from the draft often by paying a fixed fine or commutation fee, or by hiring substitutes to go into the ranks in their place. The Quakers officially disapproved of all these methods and demanded unconditional exemption. In the World War total exemption from the draft on conscientious grounds was impossible. The policies used by the government in dealing with the objectors were different in the two periods. There is scarcely any mention of the so-called idealistic objector in the Civil War period, warranting the inference that this class did not measurably figure in the situation then yet.

One point of particular interest which the comparison brings out is the differences in the distribution of the objectors among the various bodies. During the Civil War the principal denominations whose members claimed exemption were: Society of Friends, Mennonites, Dunkards, Shakers, Community of True Inspiration (Amana Society), Schwenkfelders, and Christadelphians. During the World War

the first three of these and the last one named appear again, and there are recorded at least twenty-three other minor sects and groups who furnished objectors in small numbers.

While complete statistics as to the numbers who refused to take up military service are not available for either period, partial figures on the distribution of objectors during the World War have been compiled. In the Civil War the largest number of conscientious objectors presumably came from the Society of Friends. In the late war it was the Mennonites who supplied about one-half of all the religious objectors who refused both combatant and non-combatant service. One tabulation for instance, which is not complete but covers the objectors found in twenty camps, shows that out of a total of 1060 such objectors 554 were Mennonites. Another table shows that of 359 religious objectors who were court-martialed and sentenced for their principles 138 were Mennonites. In view of the fact that two other historic non-resistant bodies, each with a total membership approximately double that of all Mennonites of the United States taken together, also supplied objectors in these particular groups, it is interesting to note that in the first tabulation mentioned above these together numbered 117 and in the second table their numbers are 37. In contemplating these facts one is led to ask whether possibly there is a direct relation between the preponderance of Mennonites among these objectors and the lack of a "social sense", which Major Kellogg deplored so greatly in the Mennonites. Perhaps their social non-conformity bears some direct ratio to the strength of their religious convictions and saved them from the contagion of frenzied fear and hatred which the engines of propaganda manufactured and fed to the more enlightened portion of the population, who presumably possessed a "social sense."

This book at its close has a complete and well-organized bibliography covering about all the literature in English which touches on the problems of conscientious objection. There is a good index at the end. A small number of misprints mar slightly the otherwise excellent form in which this volume is presented.

What will be the future status of the conscientious objectors with the government it is impossible to say. Past records seem to show that governments profit little from previous experience with the problem. Instead of formulating a policy of dealing with them between wars when there is opportunity for cool and deliberate decision, the problem is ignored until the strong pressure of circumstances forces a hasty and often ill-formed policy. Major Kellogg at the close of his book recognized the need of deciding upon a definite policy on the matter and expresses the hope that the government officials will give their attention to finding a solution for the problem before another emergency arrives. His naive suggestion that much of it can be solved by special attention to the education of the backward groups that furnished most of the objectors again reveals how little he appreciates the religious viewpoint on the question of war.

So far as concerns the religious conscientious objectors themselves, they are not interested in dictating to the government what status shall be assigned to them, although probably few persons will

blame them for claiming the freedom of conscience which the national Constitution and many State Constitutions guarantee. It would doubtless be an advantage to them also if the government were to adopt some fixed policy on how they might expect to be dealt with. But they will not condition their religious convictions on whether there is such a fixed policy or not. Mr. Needles in his closing paragraph sets down the essence of the problem from the objector's viewpoint.

"From all that has been said in this and preceding chapters the conclusion is inevitable that only those persons whose scruples against war are deeply rooted can hold out against military authority. In the Civil War and World War the individuals who lacked the courage of their convictions were inevitably absorbed by the powerful military machine. No one is wise enough to estimate the effect which these courageous consciences of the past have had on the power of war. . . . Perhaps the time is not far distant when most people will learn to 'live in the virtue of that life and power' which will take away the occasion for wars."